

FBIS**DAILY REPORT****CONTENTS***Soviet Union*

Vol III No 100

24 May 1982

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Bovin Views U.S. Disarmament Proposals	AA	1
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on U.S. Arms Talks Policy [21 May]	AA	2
CW Ban Needed in View of U.S. Buildup [Myasnikov in PRAVDA 15 May]	AA	3
Vienna Forum Views Evils of Chemical Weapons	AA	7
U.S. Fails to Prove USSR Toxic Agents Use	AA	7
PRC Diplomat on Soviet CBW Use Criticized [Biryukov]	AA	8

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Booklet Outlines Trade Cooperation	BB	1
Compensatory Agreements	BB	1
Joint Ventures	BB	1
E. Bloc Parties Discuss Sports Cooperation [PRAVDA 7 May]	BB	2

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

International Observers Roundtable for 23 May [Ariyevich, Kornilov, Lomeyko]	CC	1
Reaction to Brezhnev Speech	CC	1
Focus on Europe	CC	2
Geneva Disarmament Talks	CC	2
NATO Spring Session	CC	5
Falklands Crisis Discussed	CC	5
IZVESTIYA's Bovin Interviewed on World Events	CC	7
NOVOYE VREMYA Explains USSR Seabed Mining Decree [Sivtsev, 14 May No 20]	CC	10
Austrian Daily Interviews CPSU's Zagladin [Vienna ARBEITER-ZEITUNG 21 May]	CC	12

FALKLAND ISLANDS CRISIS

TASS Issues Statement on Falklands Situation	DD	1
Moscow Cites British Daily on Falklands Invasion [Belyanskiy]	DD	1
Britons' View of Anglo-Argentine Conflict [Ilyashenko]	DD	2
Britain's Problems in Falklands, EEC Examined [Sobolev]	DD	3
U.S. Aid to Britain Cited as 'Imperialist' [Korionov]	DD	4
Moscow Calls U.S. Document 'Dishonest' [Rostovstev]	DD	4
Pinochet Takes Pro-British Position; Gives Aid	DD	5

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Rome Paper Cites Moscow Sources on U.S. A 1
[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 18 May]
PRAVDA Hits U.S. Concept of National Interest A 2
[Vasilyev, 17 May]

CHINA

Beijing Not Interested in Improving Relations [Glebov] B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

South Korea Announces Cabinet Reshuffle C 1
Kharkov Analysis C 1

SOUTH ASIA

USSR, India Sign Space Research Agreement D 1
Mrs Gandhi To Visit USSR in September D 1
Sino-Indian Border Talks Begin in Delhi D 1
Ulov Commentary D 1
Television Report [Kalyagin] D 2
Gavrilov Comments on Indian-Afghan Relations D 3
Korolev Views Geneva Talks on Afghanistan D 4
Karmal Stops Over in Tashkent, Kiev en Route to GDR D 5
Received by Rashidov D 5
Kiev Stop D 5
Kabul Curfew Time Reduced by One Hour D 5
IZVESTIYA on USSR-Mongolia Border Fires [Kleva, 18 May] D 5

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Minister Reports on Training for Vietnamese E 1
Tikhonov Receives SRV Ambassador 14 May E 1
Briefs: Trade Protocol With Thailand E 1

EASTERN EUROPE

TASS Reports Changes in Romanian Government F 1
PRAVDA Reports Rusakov Departure for Warsaw [18 May] F 1
Shalygin Commentary on Zhivkov-Jaruzelski Talks F 1
Kornilov Views U.S. 'Intervention' in Poland F 2
Tsoppi Comments on Polish Unrest, West's Role F 3
[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 12 May]
Chemical Defense Academy Receives Polish Award F 4
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 May]

WESTERN EUROPE

IZVESTIYA Notes Opposition to Change in France G 1
[Krivopalov, 16 May]
Spanish Support for U.S., UK Evokes Concern G 3
Future of U.S. Bases in Greece Discussed G 3
FRG Eases Restrictions on Weapons Export G 4
[Grigoryants in IZVESTIYA 18 May]
Moscow Views NATO Intentions for Turkey G 5

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Soviet Peace Delegation Ends Syrian Visit	H	1
PRAVDA on European Council Meeting in Jerusalem [Glukhov]	H	1
Israeli Defense Minister's U.S. Visit Noted	H	2
Commentary on U.S. Talks With Morocco's Hassan	H	2
NOVOYE VREMYA Comments on U.S. Goals in Mideast	H	2
Commentary on History of Relations With Iran	H	3

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Anti-Soviet Statements by Numayri, Barre Viewed [Tanov]	J	1
USSR, Ethiopia Sign Cooperation Agreement	J	1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU CC Plenum Opens, Brezhnev Gives Report	R	1
Moscow Sources Cited on Economic Problems, Change [Rome LA REPUBBLICA 19 May]	R	1
Further on Komsomol Congress Proceedings	R	2
Pastukhov Report	R	2
TV Coverage 20 May	R	3
Brezhnev's Speech in Brochure	R	3

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU CC Resolution on Oil, Gas Industry [PRAVDA 27 Apr]	S	1
PRAVDA Urges Faster Coal Industry Development [17 May]	S	4
Ministries Reply to Criticism on AES Construction [IZVESTIYA 13 May]	S	5

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

RSFSR Presidium Examines Agricultural Work [IZVESTIYA 13 May]	T	1
Ukrainian Official Views Rural Conditions [Vatchenko]	T	1
'Rural Hour' Program on Agriculture Topics	T	2
Early May Weather, Crop Development Reviewed [Orlova in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 14 May]	T	2
Agricultural Developments for 21, 22, 23 May	T	3

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Progress of Space Complex Program Described	U	1
Launch of Progress-13	U	1
Launching of Cosmos-1368 Satellite Announced	U	1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Further Materials on All-Army Conference Party	V	1
Comparison on Ustinov Speech	V	1
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial [15 May]	V	1
First Deputy Defense Minister on Victory Day [Sokolov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 May]	V	3

BOVIN VIEWS U.S. DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS

LD240020 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 23 May 82

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by IZVESTIYA political observer A. Bovin]

[Excerpts] Good evening comrades. International life is moving and changing very fast. Yesterday some events overshadowed the others, others do that today, tomorrow there will be others. But whatever surprises and topics are produced by international politics, behind these events, these surprises and topics, can be seen the primary and fundamental problem of the present day. It is the problem of disarmament and first of all nuclear missile disarmament.

Frankly speaking, when you compare the endless talks on disarmament with the actual growth of rearmament which is going on simultaneously, the question unwittingly arises: Are the people actually able to come to an agreement on disarmament; are the states, classes, going to rise above the opposing interests which divide them and come to an agreement? Unfortunately historical experience pushes one toward fairly pessimistic conclusions. Yet, comrades, there are still reasons for optimism. It may be that for the first time in history there is now a real general interest, interest to live, prevent a deadly catastrophe, save and preserve civilization. We have come close to a point beyond which it is simply frightening to look and because of this, disarmament has become the categorical imperative of our time. This is well understood here in the Soviet Union. I think that there is no question connected with disarmament on which our country has not submitted simple and clear and far-reaching proposals.

But the partners we have now are not among the easiest. However, I think Romain Rolland said something like "you begin to learn something in life when you hit sharp corners." Sharp corners teach even the Americans, and on 9 May the U.S. President finally, after a very long period of thinking, agreed to resume talks on the reduction of strategic weapons. This is, no doubt, a step in the right direction. At the same time, Reagan expressed the hope, as he said, to build more constructive relations with the Soviet Union. I do not doubt, said the President, that the Soviet people and the Soviet leaders too, are vitally interested in preventing the use of nuclear weapons.

Well in this case, the truth comes from the mouth of the President. Unfortunately we are not getting our share of truths. It is possible that many Americans, and America's allies, feel ill at ease to hear, and this again was said by Reagan, that the instability and the conflicts in Africa and Central America, are brought about by force acting on Soviet instructions.

But let us leave the rhetoric for the actual facts. Speaking about the American views, expressed by the U.S. President, concerning the reduction of strategic weapons, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev said that the American position is an absolutely one sided one, not realistic, divorced from life and may even be a simply insincere position.

What has led to such a sufficiently severe and at the same time just evaluation? Let us examine that. I remind you that the United States and the Soviet Union have difference structures of strategic forces. The Soviet Union has given higher attention to the development of land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles and we have more such missiles than the Americans, and it is here that most of the nuclear warheads are concentrated. The Americans followed a different way. They put the development of the strategic air force and the development of submarine-based ballistic missiles first. As a result, out of the total number of nuclear warheads at the disposal of the United States, approximately 10,000, more than half or more accurately 5,280, are deployed and based on submarines.

In comparison, the Soviet Union has 2,000 warheads on its submarines. And concerning land-based intercontinentally ballistic missiles, the United States has a little over one-fifth of the total nuclear warheads.

If you add up all these inequalities, then on the whole, we have an approximate general nuclear missile parity in the end. And what does Reagan propose? He offers to bring the first stage of the talks in essence to a reduction of land-based ballistic missiles, that is precisely in that part of the strategic potential where the Soviet Union has superiority, and those parts of the strategic potential where the Americans lead, they remain, in essence, outside the framework of the talks. Moreover, the Americans are not at all willing to discontinue their new programs, whether it is a matter of cruise missiles, or B-1 bombers, or Trident-II missiles for submarines.

It is of course natural that the Americans are worried by our large ballistic missiles, but we are no less worried about the American submarines, the missiles on submarines, and if you speak seriously you must take into consideration and reckon this and that, consider the interests of equal security of the sides. The Americans are trying to increase their security of the sides. The Americans are trying to increase their security at the expense of ours. And this is the kind of picture you get on the whole.

Well I do not know what are Washington's considerations while offering such unbalanced ideas. In any case even in the West and even in America, they immediately understood what it is all about. I will quote here some typical remarks. Let us take the FRG. In the newspaper KOELNER STADT ANZEIGER, I read: the new Reagan initiative, just as the zero option, serves only as alibi for the international public, the allies, and his own people. The Americans do not hide that for them it is a matter first of all of reducing the number of Soviet missiles which, according to their opinion, are the most dangerous. And here are remarks from the U.S. TIME magazine, and I quote: Reagan's proposals are so ambitious and so clearly in favor of the United States that they will most probably raise the question of realism and even sincerity about the approach of the Reagan administration to the establishment of control over weapons.

Well that is how things are. Of course in the West there are not only criticisms, there are many who approve and share the American proposals, some because they do not understand the essence of the matter, others because it suits them to harm the interests of the Soviet Union. I will not guess to which of the two categories belong the NATO foreign ministers who in their last session have precisely approved and supported the American position.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA ON U.S. ARMS TALKS POLICY

LD211226 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 21 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 21 May, TASS -- The consent of the United States to the Soviet Union's proposal for resuming talks on limiting and reducing strategic armaments announced by the U.S. President in his speech on May 9 is regarded in Moscow as a step in the right direction," the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes today. "However, one cannot but make one substantive reservation as regards the essence of the U.S. position." The paper writes in its international commentary. "The U.S. position is absolutely unilateral in nature, above all, because the United States would like to exclude from the talks the types of strategic armaments it is now most intensively developing."

The trouble is, the paper writes further, that the White House "is guided by the principle of unilateral advantage, not the principle of equal security. Ronald Reagan's "zero option" proposed on November 18, 1981 is nothing else than a proposal for the Soviet Union to disarm unilaterally. A new such attempt was made in the speech on May 9.

"True, once again the coating is attractive, tempting and eye-catching: to reduce strategic arsenals substantially starting with the most dangerous, destabilising missiles (although those in charge of developing U.S. 'first strike' capability are alleging that the destabilising missiles are found anywhere but in the United States itself...in effect another proposal for a unilateral disarmament is being made! Another 'zero option' is proposed -- and not for both partners in the talks, but only for one of them -- the USSR. The United States would like to eliminate the Soviet Union's advantage in certain components, while leaving its own intact."

"Where is, one may ask, equality and a balanced approach?" The paper queries, "And one more thing: Does Washington hope that Russians, Americans and Europeans will fail to figure out what is what and will be misled by pseudo-radicalism and pseudo peaceableness? Of course they will figure it out, they will get to the crux of the matter, and won't be deceived!"

"The Soviet Union has repeatedly declared that it will not allow anyone to build up superiority over itself in the arms race imposed on it or to outtrick it at the negotiating table. How much time will it take Washington to come to realize that?"

"No matter how the White House argues about the strategic party," the paper writes, "it objectively exists. And this parity pre-supposes equal reductions. Leonid Brezhnev underlined that it is essential that Soviet-U.S. talks should begin in the right key from the very outset. This means in the first place that no one should attempt to encroach on the legitimate security interests of the other side. This means to conduct an honest dialogue without trying to use the talks as a cover-up for the arms race. This means to strive for an honest and just accord that will not infringe on anyone's interests."

"This is the key to unlock the door to a more secure world free from the threat of nuclear catastrophe."

CW BAN NEEDED IN VIEW OF U.S. BUILDUP

PM201321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 May 82 p 4

[Col Gen V. Myasnikov article: "Ban Chemical Weapons"]

[Text] Recently the United States has been engaged with particular energy in creating and producing new weapons systems. This activity dangerous to world peace is being camouflaged with fantasies about the notorious "Soviet military threat" and the imagined U.S. "military lag." In reality it is a question of an attempt to secure military superiority over the Soviet Union and to foist American diktat on other states. Every means is being used, including the creation of new types of chemical weapons and the organization of large-scale production of them.

Judging by the remarks of representatives of the Washington administration, it is planned to rearm the American Army with the latest types of chemical weapons in the intention that the United States should become able to wage war in Europe using them on a large scale. This is also shown by the fact that it is proposed to deploy cruise missiles, aerial bombs and artillery shells fitted with the new chemical warheads first at American bases in Britain, the FRG and Italy and then in other West European countries. Moreover, Bigeye aerial chemical bombs will be carried on aircraft carriers sailing the waters of the east Atlantic and Mediterranean.

It is clear from this that the program that has been announced represents another step along the dangerous road of building up arsenals of weapons of mass destruction. As for the claims of a U.S. "lag" in this field, they are designed to deceive the peoples and help to fuel tension and fear.

The United States now has the most powerful arsenal of chemical weapons. Its foundation is made up of 55,000 tons of highly toxic neuroparalytic toxins and 150,000 tons (more than 3 million units) of chemical munitions. Despite the existence of stocks sufficient, so scientists claim, to annihilate all mankind several times over, the American government believes that this is not enough. It has embarked on the production of new poison munitions -- binary weapons -- and on the "chemical rearmament" of the armed forces on the basis of them. The program for modernizing the U.S. military chemical arsenal, costing around \$10 billion, envisages increasing the quantity of chemical munitions to 5 million units over the course of 5 years (1982-1986).

A plant for the production of around 70,000 binary munitions per years is being constructed in Arkansas (the town of Pine Bluff). The activity of many other military chemical plants has been stepped up. At the same time the number of dump and storage facilities for toxins is being increased, including in West Europe.

But matters are not confined to binary weapons. The base for fundamental research into developing other types of toxin is being expanded. A great number of private firms and institutes in the United States are seeking superpoisonous toxins against which there are no means of protection at present. In particular, research is being carried out in the field of toxins of animal and vegetable origin such as palitoxin [palitoksin] and ricin. The action of toxins is often tested not only on animals but also, the Western press has noted, on people.

The United States makes active use of its allies' scientific, technical and industrial potential to develop lethal new toxins. Thus the Stanford Center for Strategic Studies, with the participation of Britain, the FRG and Israel, has carried out research on the prospects for the development of chemical weapons in the eighties and methods of using them. According to press reports, Britain, the FRG, France, Canada, Denmark, Japan, Israel and South Africa are working in the sphere of the synthesis of new toxins. With the United States, Britain, France and the FRG are jointly developing binary chemical munitions for a rocket salvo fire system.

The U.S. Army is carrying out organizational measures to restructure and strengthen the military chemical service. In particular, chemical brigades are being introduced into Army corps and chemical battalions into divisions. Military specialists are being trained in tactics, modes and methods of the use of chemical weapons and defence against them in the relevant U.S. and allied centers. U.S. troops have protective clothing, the latest gas masks and detection and decontamination equipment. The majority of exercise and maneuvers are usually held in conformity with chemical warfare conditions.

The West claims that the "chemical rearmament" of the American troops is a U.S. "internal affair" and that it is conceived and is being implemented solely for defensive purposes. The facts show something different. Chemical weapons are not defensive weapons but offensive weapons, weapons of aggression and mass destruction. U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger openly states that the United States will constantly threaten the Soviet Union with the use of chemical weapons and will regard them as a component part of any possible conflict. In a VOA interview he intimated that the U.S. leadership is studying the question of reviewing the international treaties and agreements forbidding the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons.

The accumulation of huge stockpiles of chemical weapons threatens to turn into the death of thousands of people, especially in the conditions of densely populated Europe. The accidents and other mishaps that may occur at chemical weapons dumps are fraught with the gravest consequences. For instance, one milligram of a neuroparalytic toxin such as Sarin, which is both odorless and tasteless, is enough to kill a human being. The VX type of toxin is even more poisonous.

It is well known that 4 million liters of toxins such as Sarin and VX are being stored at U.S. army dumps on FRG territory (Hessen, Rheinland-Pfalz, Baden-Wuerttemberg).

It must be remembered that while the armies of the warring countries will have means of protection against chemical weapons which can to some extent reduce personnel losses, the civilian population is virtually defenseless against such weapons. The population's losses would be 20-30 times higher than those among the troops.

The danger of the spread of chemical weapons round the world is increasing as a result of the American administration's actions. The possibility of producing all the components of binary chemical weapons covertly, in the guise of ordinary commercial chemicals, and also their relative simplicity and ease of manufacture create the preconditions for a wide range of states to stockpile chemical weapons.

Finally, the adoption of binary weapons would create serious additional obstacles to the reaching of an agreement on banning chemical weapons in view of the difficulty of ensuring effective measures for control.

The U.S. chemical "arms upgrading" is being implemented against the background of slanderous fabrications about USSR complicity in the use of toxins in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia. This monstrous lie was required both in order to cover up America's own crimes during the aggression in Indochina and in order to justify the White House decision to start the mass production of new types of chemical weapons. The anti-Soviet falsification has now been elevated to the state level.

In March 1982 a report entitled "Chemical Warfare in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan" and containing a whole collection of fabrications about the USSR was submitted to the U.S. Congress in the name of the administration. This concoction is based on ludicrous fantasies, the bribery of bogus eyewitnesses and other machinations and is fabricated from the so-called "testimony" that "eyewitnesses" among the Pol Pot holdouts and the Afghan counterrevolutionaries gave to CIA agents, after appropriate treatment. It contains not a single fact, not a single piece of proof that can with any seriousness bear out the accusations that have been leveled. Nonetheless, certain mass news organs are widely circulating these unsubstantiated claims.

In order to persuade the allies to support the bogus story of the complicity of the USSR and other socialist countries in the use of chemical weapons, the United States sent a delegation of representatives of the State Department, the Defense Department, the CIA and other departments to Europe, after which it traveled to the Near Eastern, Southeast Asian and Far Eastern countries.

It did so despite the fact that the scientists and specialists of the UN group created on the initiative of the United States itself, after painstaking familiarization work in Indochina and Pakistan, submitted a report that absolutely no "evidence" had been discovered of the use of Soviet chemical weapons. At the same time the consequences of chemical warfare that the United States waged in Southeast Asia are being confirmed over and over again. As is well known, the use of American chemical weapons there caused extremely serious ecological changes and is continuing to cause tremendous harm to people's health.

Moreover, Washington decided to resort to a frankly underhand method and to take the path of creating "proof," systematically introducing its bogus eyewitnesses in Southeast Asia and planting "material evidence." One of the stages in the CIA's work in this direction is described in the March issue of the bulletin Covert Action. The United States sent agents into Laos to "plant" fabricated "evidence" of the use of chemical weapons. However, the saboteurs were caught redhanded by the Lao authorities.

The CIA then sent a second group of saboteurs on a mission to find and kill the captured agents in order to cover up the traces and prevent the American special services' methods of operation from being exposed. Angered by his leaders' perfidy, one of the members of the second group told representatives of the press about this.

The collection of nonexistent "evidence," the recruitment of paid "eyewitnesses," forgeries and the most incredible lies -- everything is being brought into play to bolster with "facts" the irresponsible statements of certain high-ranking U.S. representatives.

The Soviet Union's position of chemical weapons is clear: There must be no place on earth for these weapons. Production of them must be ended and they must be destroyed, and the sooner this happens, the more reliably it will be possible to protect mankind from the danger to which it is being subjected by aggressive imperialist circles. Unlike the United States, the USSR has never used chemical weapons anywhere and has never given them to other countries. The USSR was among the first countries to accede to the 1925 Geneva protocol banning the use of war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other similar gases and bacteriological agents. It has never violated the Geneva protocol and unswervingly seeks to strengthen the effectiveness of this important international document by expanding the range of signatories of it as much as possible.

The USSR has struggled and struggles continuously for the total prohibition and elimination of chemical and bacteriological weapons.

On the Soviet Union's initiative and with the world public's support, bilateral Soviet-American talks aimed at formulating a joint initiative for submission to the disarmament committee began in 1976. During these talks the USSR submitted a number of proposals that made it possible to make rapid headway toward the formulation of a convention acceptable to all countries ending the stockpiling of any means of chemical warfare and ensuring their practical elimination. However, despite the efforts of both the socialist and a number of other states, despite the appeals of the United Nations and despite the fact that all the technical aspects of the problem had been discussed, the Soviet-American talks were broken off through the fault of the United States in 1980. Washington is still refusing to resume them.

It is the U.S. stance that is the main obstacle to progress at all the international forums examining the issue of chemical weapons. And the line of blocking an agreement is pursued openly. The United States was the only one of the 157 UN members to openly oppose the world community by voting against the adoption of a UN General Assembly resolution calling on all states to refrain from producing and deploying new types of chemical weapons and stationing chemical weapons on the territory of states where there are no such weapons at present. The main reason for this U.S. reaction to the call from the United Nations was the fact that Washington regards talks on the prohibition of chemical weapons as an obstacle to its plans for expanding and renewing the American chemical arsenal.

Despite the intrigues of the opponents of peace and disarmament, the Soviet Union, as before, is consistently seeking the prohibition of chemical weapons. This principled course is enshrined in the 26th CPSU Congress decisions. The Soviet Union is prepared to sit down at the negotiating table any time and finish formulating the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and the destruction of such weapons.

VIENNA FORUM VIEWS EVILS OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS

PM201309 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 May 82 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Ban Chemical Weapons"]

[Text] Vienna -- Current problems of the struggle to ban chemical weapons have been discussed at an international symposium held on the initiative of the Vienna International Peace Institute. Participating in it were scientists and experts from Austria, the USSR, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the CSSR, the United States and the FRG.

The symposium discussed a broad range of questions which have become especially urgent in the context of U.S. President R. Reagan's decision to elaborate a new multibillion "chemical rearmament" program in the United States.

The speeches of various countries' scientists stressed the need to ban chemical weapons, which are no less a threat to humanity than nuclear combat facilities.

As Prof A. Westing, a well-known American scientist, pointed out, the danger of chemical weapons should be explained to the public by using the example of their use by U.S. forces in Vietnam.

Prof G.A. Sokolskiy, a Soviet scientist, noted that the R. Reagan administration, having formulated a "chemical rearmament" program, has thereby openly embarked on the path of a chemical arms race. He cited statistics to show that from 1978 through 1982 spending on chemical production in the United States increased nearly 400 percent.

P. Gergely (Hungary), secretary of the Trades Unions International of Chemical, Oil and Allied Workers, stated that the siting of U.S. chemical weapons stockpiles on Western European territory is a particularly great threat to the European Continent since in a future war Washington would assign it the role of the main theater of military operations. The U.S. imperialist circles must not be allowed to plunge the world into nuclear holocaust accompanied by chemical warfare, he pointed out.

I represent here the people who were the first victims of U.S. chemical warfare, Vietnamese representative (Khoan Chan Tkhieu) said. During the American aggression, he noted, approximately 43 percent of Vietnam's territory and about 2 million people were subjected to the effects of chemical warfare agents. By using them the Americans destroyed about 60 percent of the sown area of various agricultural crops in Vietnam. About 2 million Vietnamese were subjected to the effects of chemical weapons.

In spreading the lie about the "use" of Soviet chemical weapons in Afghanistan, Laos and Kampuchea, Washington is trying to force the world public to forget the crimes which it committed for 10 years in Vietnam, (Khoan Chan Tkhieu) stressed.

The plans to transform FRG territory into an arena of future nuclear and chemical war were opposed by A. Schrempf, director of the Munich International Peace Research Institute.

U.S. FAILS TO PROVE USSR TOXIC AGENTS USE

LD201034 Moscow TASS in English 1003 GMT 20 May 82

[Text] New York, 20 May, TASS -- Experts from the U.S. State Department have failed in their attempt to prove a new "fact" of the USSR's alleged involvement in the use of toxic substances in Southeast Asia, something they are trying to do for a long time already. As reported by the newspaper NEWSDAY, a chemical analysis of a liquid sent by the U.S. Embassy in Bangkok as "material evidence" showed that it is nothing but ordinary penicillin. As it was stated by a representative of the State Department, who chose not to name himself, the people in Washington were waiting for a totally different result.

It is noted that "samples of toxic agents of Soviet production" were brought to the American embassy by one (Fred Zabitoeki) who during the "dirty war" in Vietnam commanded units of the notorious Green Berets. Now he is among the surviving Pol Potists who are committing acts of subversion against Kampuchea from the territory of Thailand. In their desire to slander the Soviet Union at all cost the U.S. authorities are not above using the services of shady characters although, as it is seen from the report on NEWSDAY, this "assistance" results in scandalous exposures.

PRC DIPLOMAT ON SOVIET CBW CRITICIZED

LD201718 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT 20 May 82

[By TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov]

[Text] Moscow, 20 May, TASS -- Quite unexpectedly, Washington administration officials who keep playing up all kinds of falsehoods and fabrications concerning the use of "Soviet-manufactured" chemical weapons, now in Afghanistan, the next day in Kampuchea and Laos, found themselves possessed of a worthy partner. He is no other than Shi Jinkun, military adviser for the mission of the People's Republic of China at the United Nations. Speaking at Princeton University after Gary Crocker of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research at the U.S. Department of State who discoursed upon the mentioned subject, the Chinese diplomat said that he shared Mr Crocker's "concern". Shi Jinkun blabbed out that Beijing had no irrefutable proofs, but nevertheless maintained that Russians could use chemical weapons in Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Laos, since the congruency (?) of "our proofs" notwithstanding, they (Russians) still had a chance to refute them. [as received]

One can only wonder at the abilities of the Chinese diplomat who, while attached to the U.N. mission of his country, knows very little about its activities. He does not know, for example, that U.N. expert groups, set up on the initiative of the United States, failed to find any proofs of the use of Soviet-manufactured chemical weapons during a thorough investigation carried out by them in Indochina and Pakistan. And besides, the Chinese diplomat has truly stunning logics. There are no proofs, it turns out, but still -- Russia can do anything!

Habitually casting aspersions on the Soviet Union, trying to picture it, not the United States, as the main source of war danger, the Chinese diplomat acted as a yes-man for fabricators from the Central Intelligence Agency.

And this is at a time when the world public, including American public, is alarmed over the multibillion program for large-scale production of chemical weapons including its new types, binary ammunitions, announced by Washington last February. But instead of opposing the Pentagon's dangerous plans together with all peace forces of the world, Beijing evidently is in a hurry to "share concern" with those and, using slander against the Soviet Union as a screen, as trying to make people forget hard facts concerning the use of chemical weapons by the United States in Vietnam, Laos, Kampuchea, and now in Afghanistan, too, those who are launching large-scale preparations of the armed forces of the United States and its allies for a chemical war with the use of those mass annihilation weapons.

CEMA BOOKLET OUTLINES TRADE COOPERATION

Compensatory Agreements

LD211526 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 21 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 21 May, TASS -- A promising form of economic ties (including those in the field of industry) of CEMA member countries with developing countries is co-operation on the basis of compensatory agreements. Under these agreements the developing states where works were constructed in co-operation with the CEMA countries meet their obligations through deliveries of those enterprises or some other commodities, says the booklet "Co-operation of the CEMA Member Countries and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance with the Developing States" Issued by the CEMA Secretariat this year.

Co-operation on the compensatory basis plays an important role in expanding exports from developing nations to European CEMA member countries. Products they supply to socialist countries under these agreements are not only raw materials, but also semi-finished items and products of manufacturing industry, machine building and light industry.

Co-operation on compensatory terms makes it possible to expand mutually advantageous commercial and economic ties with a number of developing states on a stable, long-term basis, to plan on a long-term basis the imports of commodities needed for CEMA member countries. A 2.5 million tons per year bauxite mining complex in Guinea built with the support of the USSR provides an example of co-operation on the compensatory basis. Deliveries of bauxite to the Soviet Union have become an essential item of Guinean exports.

The Soviet Union has been co-operating on a long-term and large-scale compensatory basis with Afghanistan and Iran in natural gas, with Iraq -- in oil, with Turkey -- in alumina. During 1976-1980 imports by the Soviet Union from the enterprises built in developing countries with its technical assistance amounted to over 2.8 billion dollars.

Seamless pipes which are part of the products manufactured by the plant built in India with the assistance of Hungarian organizations are to be supplied to Hungary under a compensatory agreement. Bulgarian organizations provide assistance to Syria and Tunisia in developing phosphate industry on the condition of delivery of a share of their phosphates to Bulgaria.

The construction of fishery complex in Ras Kebdana (Morocco) is being completed with the assistance of Romanian organizations. It is envisaged that the expenses incurred by the Romanian side in the construction of this project will be covered by deliveries of Moroccan phosphate.

This form of co-operation, like other forms of co-operation with the developing states, was and being carried out primarily on a bilateral basis.

At the same time, the expansion and development of mutual ties, the impossibility of solving some major problems on a bilateral basis, the integration processes taking place to a certain extent in all groups of countries, necessitate objectively a more active development of multilateral co-operation, says the booklet "Co-operation of the CEMA Member Countries and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance with the Developing States".

Joint Ventures

LD200934 Moscow TASS in English 0747 GMT 20 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 20 May, TASS -- Joint ventures, another form of co-operation in the field of industry and in other fields, between the CEMA member countries and the developing states, is increasingly widely resorted to in recent years.

This form of co-operation is different from all other ones in that it calls for joint management and capital ownership as well as shared income and expenditures. In developing countries joint ventures with the participation of organizations of the CMEA member countries are, as a rule, set up in the form of bilateral joint-stock companies, says the booklet "Co-operation of the CMEA Member Countries and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance With the Developing States" issued by the CMEA Secretariat this year.

Up to now over 100 joint companies with the participation of organizations of the CMEA members countries have been set up in developing states of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

These joint companies are subject to the legal regime of a particular developing country, including regulations concerning the amount of participation in the stock capital. The important thing here is that the respective developing country, if it so wishes, has the right to buy out the share of the organization of the socialist country and thus to become a full-fledged owner of the company and its enterprise.

The following examples reflect co-operation in this field of co-operation.

Construction of metal products plants in Kenya and Ghana, a dye-producing factory in Indonesia, a pharmaceutical products factory in Nigeria, an agricultural implements plant in Ethiopia and a spinning mill and sugar mills in Iraq has been the result of the joint companies' activities with the participation of Polish organizations. Operating through joint companies Bulgarian organizations have built a pharmaceutical chemicals plant and a cognac distillate factory in Algeria. The Hungarian People's Republic in co-operation with local firms is participating in the activity of the joint companies engaged in producing metalwares in Nigeria, light bulbs in Sri Lanka, medical preparations in India and Nigeria and manufacturing cheese in Lebanon. The joint Czechoslovak-Nigerian company for collection and processing of rubber has been operating for a long time. A Cuban-Libyan joint company is engaged in designing, research and construction of various infrastructure projects, etc.

It should be emphasized that in carrying out the co-operation projects under the joint venture and joint company agreements the partners pursue the policy whereby manufacturing of certain components originally centred in the CMEA member countries is gradually carried over to developing states while, at the same time, the share of components imported from respected socialist partner countries is being reduced.

Operation of joint companies in developing countries with the participation of socialist community countries' organizations shows that this form of economic relations adequately meets potentialities and interests of the partners, says the booklet "Co-operation of the CMEA Member Countries and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance With the Developing States."

E. BLOC PARTIES DISCUSS SPORTS COOPERATION

PM111435 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 82 p 4

[Text] TASS Representatives of the BCP, the MSZMP, the Vietnam Communist Party, the SED, the Communist Party of Cuba, the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the PZPR, the RCP, the CPSU and the CPCZ had a working meeting on 6 May [venue not stated]. Taking part were heads of sporting organizations.

Views were exchanged on questions relating to the development of mass physical culture and sport and to the further expansion and deepening of sporting cooperation among the socialist countries.

The meeting took place in a businesslike and friendly atmosphere.

INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE FOR 23 MAY

LD231553 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 23 May 82

["International Observers Roundtable" program, presented by Gennadiy Mikhaylovich Ariyevich, all-union radio commentator on foreign political affairs, with TASS political observer Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov and LITERATURNAYA GAZETA political observer Vladimir Borisovich Lomeyko]

Reaction to Brezhnev Speech

[Text] [Ariyevich] Good day, esteemed comrades. Last week our country again persuasively demonstrated that it is prepared to take specific, practical action to promote the preservation and strengthening of peace, disarmament and the intensification of detente. That is precisely how many observers, public figures and politicians in various countries evaluate Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's speech at the opening of the 19th Congress of the Lenin Komsomol. A vast stream of reactions to this speech has been coming in from all parts of our planet. The speech is being given prime attention. I would like to single out from this stream the reactions of the socialist countries. This is because the position, the proposals put forward by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev are the concentrated expression of the concerted and shared foreign policy course of the socialist community. TRYBUNA LUDU, the central organ of the PZPR, writes that Comrade Brezhnev's speech at the Komsomol congress confirmed that the CPSU takes an optimistic view of the world, and of the future of Europe and the entire world. This optimism stems from a belief in the growing might of the world's peace-loving forces, among which the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community occupy a special place. The Bulgarian RABOTNICHESKO DELO stresses that it is precisely specific work for the sake of a cloudless future that is winning the Soviet Union the trust, gratitude and support of millions of people on the planet.

[Kornilov] Comrade Brezhnev's speech was also greeted with great interest in the United States. I would like to remind you that of late, the antiwar, antimissile movement has spread widely there, as in the rest of the world. Evidently it is largely under the influence of this that many sober-minded politicians and public figures in the United States, who are aware of what nuclear war means today, have quite rightly evaluated the new Soviet initiatives, including the Soviet proposals for a quantitative freeze on Soviet and U.S. strategic systems and maximum restriction on their modernization, as a huge and bold step forward.

[Lomeyko] I would say that the reaction in the United States to Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's speech was equivocal and contradictory. The ruling circles, for example, evidently did not expect such a calm, constructive and businesslike proposal. That is why the White House issued a statement saying that the United States welcomed the readiness proclaimed by the Soviet leadership to commence talks and stressed that the proposal would be studied in detail. In other words, the Soviet proposals could no longer be rejected out of hand, as has been the case in the past. But the future will show what lies behind this tactic.

[Ariyevich] Evidently the consistent policy of our country and the mass movement in Europe and the United States itself for the prevention of war are plainly having an impact on the White House. And one would like to hope that the talk about peace is not just a tactical ploy. This, as Leonid Ilich Brezhnev stressed in his speech to the 19th Komsomol Congress, is because it is now not enough to talk about peace. Specific and practical deeds are needed. This is a very important and topical consideration. After all, the policy of the most aggressive forces of imperialism raises the following question today: What do the peoples expect -- peaceful creation or the nightmare of nuclear annihilation? The answer to this question depends on the degree of activity and consistency in the policy of peace-loving countries, and the degree of resolution and cohesiveness in the defense of peace on earth by many millions of people. Here, in the socialist countries, words and deeds do not diverge. By its deeds the Soviet Union proves the honesty of its intentions and its readiness to reach agreement on the basis of equality and identical security.

Focus On Europe

[Lomeyko] In his speech at the Komsomol congress, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev paid considerable attention to Europe. He said that the crucial task today is to reduce the nuclear confrontation in Europe, which has reached dangerous proportions, and to halt the further buildup of nuclear potentials. What dictates putting the question this way? Why is it a matter of Europe, first and foremost? The whole point is that it is on the continent of Europe that the danger of a nuclear conflict is felt especially strongly. It is there that the greatest stockpiles of nuclear weapons are accumulated, and it is there that two military-political blocs directly confront each other. In recent years the feeling of a danger of nuclear war in Europe has grown sharply. This dread has become stronger, especially following the December 1979 NATO session, where the decision to deploy 572 new U.S. missiles was made, and following Ronald Reagan's statement in March 1981 that the use of nuclear weapons in the European theater without one of the great powers becoming directly involved in the conflict was quite thinkable. These are the circumstances that have brought together millions of people in West Germany, Belgium, Italy, Holland, Britain and other countries in an active antiwar movement.

[Ariyevich] I think that Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's proposals for reducing nuclear confrontation in Europe have also drawn the attention of the whole world because they were outlined on the eve of a fresh round of talks on restricting nuclear weapons in Europe, being conducted in Geneva between the Soviet Union and the United States. These talks began in November last year, but so far have not produced any practical results.

Geneva Disarmament Talks

[Kornilov] Well, that is not surprising, if you take account of the fact that the U.S. delegation in Geneva -- where, incidentally, the second round of the talks has just resumed -- is proposing, or at least has until now proposed, deliberately unacceptable conditions; Reagan's so-called zero option, of which the essence is that the United States, so it says, is prepared not to deploy its new cruise missiles and Pershing missiles, if the Soviet Union removes all its SS-20 missiles from its European part. The proposal is intended for uninformed, muddled and misinformed people, for the essence of it is to achieve what is in fact unilateral disarmament by the Soviet Union.

[Lomeyko] Evidently, the point is that here the U.S. forward-based weapons around Europe are simply not taken into account, nor the British and French nuclear forces, to which these SS-20 missiles are a counterbalance.

[Ariyevich] Even many U.S. and West European politicians and specialists, immediately after Reagan's proposal for a zero option, said that this proposal is unjust and hence unrealistic. The question arises: How will Americans behave in the future? Will they, as before, drag things out, preparing to deploy the missiles, or will they display a readiness to come to agreements?

[Lomeyko] Yes, this really is the \$64 question. And today it is difficult to give an unambiguous answer, primarily because Washington's line of behavior is determined not just by the intentions of the U.S. administration, but also by the influence on it of many weighty factors -- the general world atmosphere, the mood of both the U.S. and the West European public, the stand of its NATO allies, and other circumstances. Even at the end of the seventies the predominant influence in the United States had been gained by those forces opposing detente and supporting the achievement of military superiority over the USSR. This course gained official support from the White House when the new Reagan administration moved in. Hence the complete and originally openly defiant unwillingness to conduct any talks with the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, a big mechanism of demagoguery was put into action to deceive the world public and also those West European allies which insisted on dialogue with the Soviet Union. Washington agreed to the so-called NATO dual decision, that is, increasing disarmament [as heard] and at the same time, talks.

In fact, on various pretexts, the Americans delayed the beginning of talks until the end of November 1981, that is, 2 whole years.

[Ariyevich] Having come to the talks, the United States has taken a position of procrastination, putting forward unrealistic proposals of which we have already spoken, in particular, the notorious zero option. By contrast, in November 1981, during his visit to Bonn, Comrade Brezhnev put forward a broad program for reduction of nuclear potential, proposing, in the final analysis, the elimination of all medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

[Kornilov] We can all remember NATO's and, above all, Washington's reaction to this proposal. The West declared that this would be going too far. Whipping up a noisy campaign over Reagan's so-called zero option, the Western mass propaganda media tried to belittle the significance of the Soviet proposals and quite simply to hush them up, although a large number of specialists and many of those involved in the antiwar movement said, with full justification, that a Europe free of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical, would really be a zero option.

[Lomeyko] Yes, Moscow could not be reproached with an unconstructive approach. Taking various wishes into consideration, we proposed a reduction in medium-range nuclear weapons of more than two-thirds. The reply the West gave us was that this was too little. Well, one could seek other mutually-acceptable formulas, as long as the political good will for this exists. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we have no lack of that. To demonstrate this political good will for detente and for curbing the nuclear arms race, the Soviet Union recently halted the further deployment of medium-range missiles -- the so-called SS-20's -- in the European part of the USSR, and, incidentally, it did this unilaterally. Moreover, a certain proportion of these missiles was cut. And what happened?

[Ariyevich] Yes, this is a real and genuine step along the road of military detente. It was welcomed everywhere, but it did not elicit any enthusiasm among Western partners. The professional skeptics were quick to obscure the issue: They asserted that the withdrawal of missiles beyond the Urals did not alter the heart of the matter; they alleged, they alleged, reach West European countries from beyond the Urals. And it must be admitted that this argument unfortunately worked on many people in the West.

[Kornilov] That is why Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's statement that no medium-range missiles would be deployed within range of the FRG or other countries of West Europe was so important.

[Ariyevich] I should like to add that a no less important role in refuting conjectures of all kinds was played by Comrade Brezhnev's statement that the decision on the unilateral freezing of medium-range missiles which we took also provides for a halt to preparations for deploying such missiles. There has also been a good deal of speculation on this in the West.

[Kornilov] Yes, the problem of reducing nuclear weapons in Europe is undoubtedly one of the key aspects of averting the growing threat of war. But there is another issue -- and this was stressed in Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's speech at the Komsomol congress -- on whose resolution the destinies of war and peace depend to a large degree: the issue of whether a Soviet-American agreement is or is not reached on limiting and reducing strategic armaments, the most dangerous and costly weapons, an agreement which is honest, just and encroaching on no one's interests.

[Ariyevich] At the 26th CPSU Congress, the imitation and reduction of strategic armaments was said to be a problem of extraordinary importance and the solution of this problem is all the more important as the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction by the sides -- if it is not halted on the basis of a treaty -- could cut the ground from under those agreements on limitation, reduction and control which are still possible.

And here, as in issues to do with the future of Europe, the position of our country was and remains clear, well-defined and unvarying in the extreme.

The Soviet Union has consistently advocated and is advocating a start to talks aimed at drawing up an appropriate agreement without delay and without any linkages, and, naturally, taking account of all the factors which determine the strategic situation. That is why, when President Reagan gave a speech in the town of Eureka, Illinois, recently, and declared, for his part, or rather, finally declared, that the United States is willing to resume talks, this declaration was interpreted in our country as a step in the right direction.

[Lomeyko] Yes, a step in the right direction, but it is just a step, the first step. But in order for real progress to be achieved it must be followed by other steps -- constructive and mutually-acceptable ones. In other words, the point is that the statement of willingness to hold talks must be backed up by some sort of realistic program. Moreover, I should like to draw attention to the fact that this program must be one in which each of the opposing sides puts itself in the place of the other, in other words, does not attempt to use one-sided advantages to the detriment of the other side.

[Kornilov] That is the main thing, of course. Unfortunately, if you examine the real meaning of the ideas expressed by the U.S. President, you can see that it is absolutely one-sided in nature -- so far, at least. This is because, first and foremost, the United States would like to completely exclude from discussion during the talks those of strategic armament which they are developing most intensively at the present time. These include the MX and Trident-2 strategic missiles, sea- and air-based missiles, and long-range cruise missiles upon which the United States is placing particular reliance. The possibility of limiting the strategic air force, where, as we know, the United States has an advantage, is no more than implied in these proposals, and then only during the second stage of the reduction of strategic forces, after a proportion of the land-based missiles have been eliminated. The existing strategic systems of Britain and France are not counted.

[Lomeyko] I would like to say this. It seems to me that the Americans are proposing a reduction in those areas where they consider the Soviet Union has an advantage. At the same time they are keeping quiet about those types of strategic armament in which they themselves have an advantage.

[Ariyevich] In the United States itself there are authoritative people who, in commenting on the U.S. President's proposals, note that the position taken is unrealistic, detached from life and maybe insincere, simply and directly intended to be detrimental to the security of the Soviet Union. One can cite many statements of this kind. They have been made by Senators Kennedy, Hatfield and Cranston, by former Secretaries of State Vance and Muskie, by scientists and physicists like Kistiakowsky and Bethe, and by many others.

[Lomeyko] The same question, about which we have already spoken today, arises again here. This is the question of the way in which words and deeds correspond with each other in politics, or, put another way, the question of the glaring inconsistency which one so often sees between Washington's declarations about its love of peace and the real foreign policy line taken by the United States. After all, the question is: What needs to be done so that the strategic arms limitation talks proceed successfully and lead to agreement?

[Kornilov] That's right. An exhaustive and absolutely clear answer to this question was given by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev in his speech to the Komsomol congress. He stressed: This requires, firstly, that the talks should really pursue the goal of limiting and reducing strategic armaments and not serve as a screen for the continuation of the arms race. Secondly, it is essential for both sides to consider the legitimate interests of each other's security and to strictly adhere to the principle of equality and identical security in their conduct of these talks.

[Lomeyko] In this connection it is apposite to recall that an approximate balance in the quantity and quality of strategic nuclear armaments held by the two powers was established back in the mid-seventies. This correlation was checked out repeatedly and most painstakingly by the most qualified experts of the two sides during the process of drawing up the SALT II treaty. This made possible the conclusion that there is an approximate equality in carriers, one side having 2,500 and the other about 2,300.

[Kornilov] And finally, for the strategic arms limitation talks to proceed successfully, it is necessary to retain everything positive which was achieved earlier. After all, the talks are not starting from scratch. A large amount of work, which is certainly not superfluous, has already been done. The Soviet Union is convinced that reaching agreement on specific measures for a meaningful reduction in strategic armaments held by both sides can only be counted on if such an approach is observed.

[Ariyevich] It is also exceptionally important to reliably close off all channels for the continuation of the strategic arms race in any form. This means that the creation of new types of strategic armament must be either outlawed or confined within agreed parameters to the maximum extent possible. The Soviet Union also expresses readiness to reach an agreement under which the strategic weapons held by both sides would be frozen as soon as the talks begin.

[Kornilov] In short, progress can only be expected if the words uttered by the other side also do not diverge from its deeds.

NATO Spring Session

[Ariyevich] The obvious divergence between the high-sounding statements and the true intentions of imperialism is shown in the most varied aspects of its foreign policy. This was shown in particular by the NATO Council spring session held this week in Luxembourg. The foreign ministers of the North Atlantic bloc countries adopted a final communique containing quite a few calls for strengthening security and peace. The official propaganda passes this off almost as a cardinal change by NATO in favor of detente. In fact, however, behind the resounding phrases is concealed the aspiration to continue NATO's old course of expanding militaristic preparations. Is that not so, Vladimir Borisovich?

[Lomeyko] Yes, the final communique of the Luxembourg NATO council session is evidence of the bloc's old adherence to its policy of increasing arsenals of both conventional and nuclear weapons. And it is clear that included in the latter are primarily preparations for siting new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, based still on the old, invented pretext of a Soviet threat. Also included in the communique, at the obvious bidding of Washington, is the recommendation for members of the North Atlantic alliance to restrict development of trade and economic relations with the socialist countries. That is the true value of the high-sounding statements on continuing the policy of detente.

[Kornilov] To be fair, it must be noted here that it was not all that simple for Washington to insist on what it wanted. Even in NATO, far from everyone is now ready to share in the imperialistic, adventurist foreign policy course of the United States. Thus, Greece did not agree with the section of the communique demanding a review of economic relations between East and West, and a number of delegations protested against the demand for the very word detente to be removed from the documents of the session.

[Lomeyko] Apropos, if one reads the communique carefully, the term genuine detente is used. This is, so to speak, the compromise between Haig's demands that the word detente be removed and the demands of the West European countries to leave it.

[Kornilov] Quite so. One can also observe that a number of delegations also objected to Washington's demands for so-called discriminatory measures to be adopted against the socialist states.

[Lomeyko] Well, who wants to flog oneself? These measures are a far more painful blow for these countries than for the socialist ones.

Falklands Crisis Discussed

[Ariyevich] The NATO partners tried to use the Falklands crisis to justify their right to interference anywhere in the world. They supported Britain in its attempt to obtain a settlement by force in the conflict with Argentina.

And the Conservative Cabinet of Margaret Thatcher immediately took advantage of this support, giving the order for broad-scale operations in the South Atlantic. Using the talks in the United Nations on a peaceful settlement of the conflict as a screen, London continued to exert crude military pressure on Argentina, and now, having led these talks to a dead end by its unbending stand, it has begun an invasion of the Falklands Islands. The speech by Parsons, Britain's spokesman at the Security Council, which had gathered for an emergency session, looked like flagrant hypocrisy. While British aircraft were bombing the archipelago, ships were shelling the coast and detachments of shock landing forces were consolidating their positions, the British ambassador was sounding off about his government's aspirations for peace.

[Lomeyko] The Conservative government leans on the broad support of the United States in conducting its hard line. As the U.S. press itself has observed, following affected statements about an objective and impartial attitude to the two countries, Washington finally had to jump down from the fence of impartiality -- on the British side of it, of course. According to the Washington correspondent of the DAILY TELEGRAPH newspaper, the Pentagon has stated its readiness to put a large amount of military equipment and ammunition at Britain's disposal.

[Ariyevich] Now -- and attention has been drawn to this in UN circles -- U.S. diplomacy has become noticeably livelier, preparing to provide diplomatic cover for escalation of Britain's aggressive actions, for example, by blocking any Security Council resolution which provides for a cease-fire.

[Lomeyko] Washington's openly pro-British stand is evoking profound indignation in Argentina and in many other Latin American countries.

[Lomeyko] U.S. support for Britain's colonialist aspirations, as Argentine Minister of Economy and Finance Roberto Alemann stated in an interview with Swiss television, will have long-term consequences for Washington's relations with Latin American states.

[Kornilov] The consequences could be exceedingly serious -- and not just for the parties involved in the conflict -- and the responsibility for this lies with the British Conservative Government, and to the same degree, with Washington.

[Ariyevich] While beating its military drum and not forgetting to scream about the Soviet danger, even now that a dispute has flared up between the U.S. allies, Whitehall evidently does not believe its own screams all that much if it could dispatch nearly all of its navy to the other end of the world with such ease.

[Lomeyko] Yes, the West is trying to use any pretext -- and more often than not pretexts which it has created itself -- to denigrate socialism in general and also individual socialist countries. All methods are brought into play -- slander, threats, blackmail and attempts at interference. Even carrots are not excluded. One such carrot was the statement by the Washington administration that Cuba would be very warmly received in the bosom of the Western community if it severed its ties with the states of the socialist community. Cuban leader Fidel Castro responded very well, it seems to me. It is sometimes very difficult, Fidel Castro declared, to understand the way in which the minds of the imperialist leaders work. They probably believe that they are making us a favorable proposal, by promising the paradise of a rotten capitalist society. Meanwhile, in our own society we lead worthy and happy lives, and not just because of material prosperity, since it is not prosperity alone which makes man happy. Happiness derives from the awareness of justice, a sense of brotherhood, a high code of morality, equality, freedom and an awareness that you are part of your people and that you are working with everyone else. We are acquainted with the capitalist hell, and we shall never return to it, he said, never.

[Ariyevich] Fine words. They reflect the essence of our society, which determines the peace-loving nature of our foreign policy. It is directed at the creation of conditions for calm and peaceful creative work. And today the principal call of the times is to curb the arms race which has been unleashed through the fault of imperialism.

And our country, loyal to the Leninist policy of peace, and our friends and allies, not only declare their will for disarmament, but in practice are doing everything in their power to achieve real progress on all aspects and in all areas of this very important international problem. This principled line determines the position of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist states at the special UN General Assembly session on disarmament, which opens in New York on 7 June. The Soviet Union is convinced that this representative forum can and must not only contribute to the implementation of the decisions of the first special session on disarmament held in 1978, but also provide a fresh stimulus to talks on the urgent issues of limiting the arms race and become a landmark on the road to the convocation of a world conference on disarmament. For its part, the Soviet Union will do everything to ensure the success of this session, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev stressed in his speech at the Komsomol congress.

With that, we come to the end of the program, dear comrades, and we take our leave of you. Good-bye, and all the best.

IZVESTIYA'S BOVIN INTERVIEWED ON WORLD EVENTS

LD221646 Moscow in Hungarian to Hungary 1900 GMT 21 May 82

["Meetings at the Request of our Listeners" program, comprising unidentified correspondent's interview in Moscow with IZVESTIYA political observer Aleksandr Bovin -- recorded; data not given; Bovin replies in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation]

[Excerpt] [Question] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, many listeners are interested in your journalistic work, asking which historically significant events [words indistinct].

[Answer] Perhaps the most significant event about which I have written thus far was the Helsinki conference. Then everyone, including myself, thought that the time had finally come when situations of conflict would sink into the past, and a wide, main road would open to detente. Naturally, then too there were various (?theses) of this. But frankly, we hoped that detente would develop. Unfortunately, things turned out slightly (?otherwise).

[Question] Lajos Jozsef from Kaposvar, Gyula (?Neopol) from Budapest and Andras (Pisztai) from Dunaujvaros ask you to speak about the present international situation of the Soviet Union, the prospects of the fight for peace in Europe and the world, and the (?path) of the Helsinki process.

[Answer] Truly, if we compare the present period with the Helsinki period, then detente obviously is in a situation of crisis. There are (?many) reasons for this, the main one being the change in the foreign policy of the West, and primarily that of the United States. But this change itself has not taken place without reason; it was determined by many factors. The point is that while for us, the socialist countries, the seventies were years of detente and positive development, which satisfied (?our requirements). For the Americans those years presented a slightly different picture, (?on the one hand), yes, detente; however, on the other hand these were America's defeats in Vietnam, the Iranian revolution, Central America in turbulence, the fall of the dictatorships in Spain and Greece, and the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire.

However, all these systems were supported by the United States; and the seventies, for the average American in a [word indistinct] mood, were (?headed) by a series of American defeats in foreign policy, as they were the years of the activation and strengthening of position of the socialist countries. In the complex political atmosphere existing in the United States, this mood created the wave which (?swept) Reagan and his team to the (?top) of power. Yes, poor America, the great, the first, now suddenly has found itself in a humiliated, affronted situation. It must be saved, but how?

In theory (?two) solutions are possible: America either adjusts to the rapidly changing world in which it exists, or on the other hand, to the contrary, it (?tries) to use this world for American (?interests).

And President Reagan has chosen precisely this [word indistinct] (?road). The simplest solution is more weapons, more military [word indistinct]. President Reagan brandishes the nuclear weapons and he says that America will be great and strong again, that we will talk with the Soviet Union only from a position of strength.

[Words indistinct] the fate of detente, naturally, not only do the United States and we exist in the world, but in one respect our position is special; we must think here about the strategic situation, (?destructive) potential. This is why the fate of detente depends 90 percent on the relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States. As these relations have deteriorated, all of detente has [word indistinct]. But Helsinki, naturally, has not lost its significance. It has not lost it because the Helsinki conference showed a basic and very important thing -- namely, that if the political will exists, then however complex the issue at hand, agreement can be reached. Interests can also be coordinated, compromises can be found; (?concessions) are necessary in some things so that we should be able to advance forward together. And the significance of this lesson of Helsinki remains in spite of all the [word indistinct] of world politics. I am certain that the time will come when the experience of Helsinki will again become topical. Because [words indistinct].

[Question] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, you touched on the topic of Soviet-American relations. [passage indistinct]

[Answer] Soviet-American relations perhaps now are at a deeper point than hitherto, in comparison to what (?our relations) were like during the past 10 years. We have already spoken about the reasons for this. We have already said to the Americans more than once: Let us get to work on agreement. But this does not (?go) at the moment. You know that the talks have begun in Geneva. The zero option which the Americans submitted naturally is not a serious thing and cannot (?form) a basis for negotiations. They are preparing the (?platform) for SALT negotiations. But at the moment it is not yet known what this platform will be like. [passage indistinct]

Nevertheless, the following must be noted: Reagan has (?made quite an unusual change in the tone of his political statements. [Words indistinct] he begins to talk about peace, disarmament, he mentions the necessity of negotiations. In brief, the modifications of [words indistinct] is obvious. This, I believe, reflects a given reality. [Words indistinct], the great writer, said that a person only learns some things when he encounters [words indistinct] and the Americans are encountering precisely this [word indistinct]. They are not understood by their own allies; they exert pressure on them, demanding that they agree with them. Reagan has even (?terrified) his own America. No one even supposed that such (?an antiwar movement would gain such a scale) in the United States. [passage indistinct] But, it would be difficult at the moment to say what scale of changes might take place in policy as a result of this. As regards the Soviet Union, we are ready to talk with America, but only on an equal basis. [passage indistinct] Therefore, the ball is in the United States' court.

[Question] Many of our listeners, Jozsef (Samu) from Rudabanya, Zoltan Nagy from Peos, Imre (Kondics) from Budapest and others, ask what [words indistinct] the economic sanctions which the United States [words indistinct] have imposed on the Soviet Union and Poland?

[Answer] (?Eight) different types of sanctions were introduced against the Soviet Union. Perhaps only one has real economic (?consequence). The situation is that, according to the [word indistinct] natural gas agreement which we signed with the West European countries, they deliver to us [words indistinct] and pumping stations. [Passage indistinct] it hinders business. At the moment I (?do not really dare) to say to what extent [passage indistinct]. As regards the sanctions against Poland, [words indistinct] (?situation has developed). On the other hand, naturally they would like to hold Poland in a clamp. On the other hand, however, those bankers who have provided enormous credits and who naturally would like to get them back know well that the worse the situation is in Poland, the more difficult it will be for them to get their money back. This is precisely why they have a moderating influence on the Western governments' policy.

There is no doubt that [words indistinct] namely, the delivery of raw materials and components within the framework of the [word indistinct] has been significantly reduced. All this disturbs the development of the Polish economy, although (?there is not as much damage) as they (?think).

[Question] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, [name indistinct] from Miskolo, and Istvan Takacs from Kazincbarcika would like to hear your opinion on the present Polish situation.

[Answer] According to signs, a certain stabilization is taking place in Poland. However, the process is very complex. There are difficulties in the economy and (?politics). The main difficulty is that during the events the (?party) was demoralized to a significant extent. The most important task here [words indistinct] in the party, the renewed rallying of the party's ranks. (?So it should become an effective ideological-political force.) The Polish comrades are now working precisely on resolving this task. As regards economic life, there is progress here too, especially in mining. In this regard we are providing concrete aid. Many Soviet experts have gone to Poland so that they can assess in every single factory what it is that hinders production. They are providing aid in the relevant industrial branches. I believe [words indistinct].

[Question] From (Gyuri Sandor) -- How do you view the prospects for the (?development of cooperation) among the socialist countries? Ferenc Szabo, a listener from Tatabanya, also asks what kind of aid will the Soviet Union give to the socialist countries in the (?near) future [words indistinct]?

[Answer] The development of the socialist countries is quite a complex process. (?As I have already said), you certainly know well that the socialist countries stand at different levels of economic development. [Words indistinct] (?they have) different types of raw materials. (?They are related to various extents) to the world market, the capitalist world. And [word indistinct] creates the [words indistinct] of economic interests, which [words indistinct] in the CEMA; that is, to find solutions which would be advantageous to the given, concrete country and the entire economic community. This, really, is the essence of the coordination of economic policy, which (?we have spoken of now).

If we want to speak specifically about energy vectors, then the Soviet Union, in scale with its potentials, endeavors maximally to meet the orders which come from the socialist countries. But it must be said frankly here [word indistinct] and far from infinite. We have an enormous economy which (?requires) more (?oil) from year to year, if for example we want to speak concretely about specific raw materials. However, in spite of this, I reiterate: We endeavor maximally to take into account and to meet the interests of the fraternal countries.

[Question] This is a question from [name indistinct], a listener from (Gyoer): What is your opinion about the Chinese (?situation)?

[Answer] To answer this question briefly, I can say the following: In China, in spite of all the difficulties, in spite of the contradictions and the continuing struggle too, the process of returning to good sense is taking place (?slowly) but surely. In practice, I believe that nothing remains of the theorems of Mao Zedong, which made up the essence of the orthodox Maoism of the (?Great Leap Forward) and the Cultural Revolution. Naturally, the figure of Mao, as the symbol of the [word indistinct] revolution, the symbol of the (?unification of China), has not remained either.

China, in such circumstances, (?has certainly made steps ahead). But, in essence, [words indistinct] all of its economic and social (?theorems) which made up the characteristic nature of Maoism. In China, there are endeavors (?to return to the ideals of the eighth party congress, there are endeavors to study the experiences of other socialist countries, namely, for example, the Hungarian experiences, which [words indistinct] Chinese economists have been in Moscow to study [words indistinct].

The [word indistinct] of rational development naturally is a difficult process. The country is enormous, and the problems are also large.

[Passage indistinct] I believe that the development is progressing in a positive direction. Unfortunately, the [words indistinct] has not changed, and this one thing is of [word indistinct] significance: the relationship with the Soviet Union. Today's China shows the same, most [word indistinct] attitude to the Soviet Union, just as the China of Mao. Nevertheless, we are keeping the door open. For example, I believe -- this is my personal position -- that the internal development in China which has begun now, will lead sooner or later to a positive change of foreign policy. According to my personal predictions, in the second half of the (?eighties) some sort of normal, inter-state relations will take shape.

NOVOYE VREMYA EXPLAINS USSR SEABED MINING DECREE

PM210951 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 20, 14 May 82 pp 23-24

[I. Sivtsev article: "Law of the Sea Is a Common Interest"]

[Text] The Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea, whose proceedings have continued, with brief recesses, since 1973, is nearing its conclusion. On 30 April the final plenary sitting of its 11th session in New York approved an international convention on the law of the Sea. The signing ceremony will be held in December of this year in Caracas (Venezuela).

The international legal document approved in New York will be of great importance for regulating states' marine activity. It defines the borders of economic zones, coordinates questions of fishing both on the high seas and in economic and territorial waters, stipulates the status [rezhim] and outer limit of the continental shelf and the rules of marine and air navigation and formulates a procedure for the mining of minerals from the seabed beyond the continental shelf.

The 11th session proceeded in an atmosphere of keen political struggle. Powerful pressure was exerted on the developing countries with the aim of making them alter the agreed "package" of compromise accords in the U.S. favor. Pursuing mercenary aims, the American delegation came to the session to secure one-sided advantages for the United States. It brought with it a so-called "green book" containing pages of demands and amendments.

As was to be expected, the American delegation's stance was resolutely condemned by the overwhelming majority of conference participants since it could not only have led to the breakdown of the session but in general have jeopardized the possibility of adopting a convention in the near future. As the chairman of the "group of 77," which unites the developing countries, rightly remarked at a press conference, the United States would actually have liked to return the talks to the early seventies and start from scratch the process of preparing a new convention text.

At the same time certain demands by the United States and a number of Western states relating to participation by transnational corporations in opening up seabed deposits of cobalt, manganese, copper and nickel over the next 30 years were satisfied, to the detriment of other countries. In particular, a provision regarding the "original investor" was incorporated in Resolution 2, which regulates preliminary capital investment in initial activity connected with polymetallic modules. Under this provision, the New York TIMES wrote, eight sectors are assigned to the countries and transnational corporations that are already mining valuable minerals from the floor of the world ocean. And four of these sectors are assigned to transnational corporations among which the main role is played by American concerns such as Kennecott Copper, U.S. Steel, Sedco, Standard Oil of Indiana and Lockheed Aircraft.

Thus Washington succeeded in getting the "first come, first served" principle into the international convention on the Law of the Sea instead of the principles of equality, mutual advantage and nondiscrimination against states.

The principle essentially promotes the monopolization of the world ocean's resources and ensures preferential rights for American corporations that are aiming to freely exploit the seabed mineral resources and thereby make superprofits. However, it should not be forgotten that this principle, widely applied in the times of the colonial enslavement of countries and peoples, is unacceptable nowadays.

In view of the fact that the United States and also Britain, the FRG and France have already adopted appropriate legislation to regulate the prospecting and exploitation of mineral resources and that these countries' mining companies have started the practical implementation of the mining of minerals from the seabed, the Soviet Union was compelled to take measures to defend its legitimate interests. To this end on 17 April 1982 the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a decree "On Temporary Measures To Regulate Soviet Enterprises' Activity To Prospect for and Exploit the Mineral Resources of Regions of the Seabed Beyond the Continental Shelf."

As the decree notes, these measures are not only forced, but are also temporary. They will operate until the new convention on the Law of the Sea enters into force for the USSR, after which the decree will be rescinded.

Soviet enterprises that are granted permits to prospect for and exploit the mineral resources of regions of the seabed can carry out only preparatory work during the first stage. Under the decree, they have the right to start exploiting the mineral resources no earlier than 1 January 1988, when it is expected that the convention on the Law of the Sea that is being prepared may enter into force. Soviet enterprises will be given permits to prospect provided that they indicate in their applications for permits two sectors deemed promising with respect to mineral resources. One of the sectors is to be utilized by the enterprise itself and the other is to be reserved for possible prospecting and exploitation by the international organization for the seabed that is to be instituted after the adoption of the convention on the Law of the Sea.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree permits the competent organs in our country to determine the size and geographical coordinates of the sectors where Soviet enterprises can prospect for and exploit mineral resources.

In issuing permits for particular sectors of the seabed the Soviet Union does not claim the establishment of sovereignty, jurisdiction or the right of ownership of them and "does not recognize such claims from other states."

At the same time the decree takes into account other states' legitimate interests. For this reason the competent Soviet organs will issue permits only for sectors that do not exceed reasonable bounds in terms of their total area. The possibility is not ruled out that disputes may arise with other countries or their companies in connection with their taking action that creates obstacles for Soviet enterprises in the carrying out of work to prospect for and exploit the seabed resources. However, the competent organs of the Soviet Union, as the decree emphasizes, will take all the necessary measures to settle disputes "in accordance with the procedures provided for by the UN Charter."

The decree unambiguously notes that the competent organs of the Soviet Union will implement "cooperation with interested foreign states with a view to assisting them to develop technology, produce equipment, carry out measures to prevent the pollution of the natural environment and train cadres and on other questions connected with the prospecting and exploitation of the resources of regions of the seabed."

This provision of the decree shows that the Soviet Union is prepared to share its experience with both socialist countries and the developing countries that have embarked on the road of independent development and to give them the necessary assistance in opening up seabed mineral resources.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree of 17 April 1982 shows that the measures being taken by the Soviet Union do not contravene the basic convention of the Law of the Sea but rather complement the convention.

The legislation of the United States, Britain, the FRG and France is different in nature. In particular, the American law on "solid mineral resources of the deep water seabed," under which American companies prospect for and exploit raw materials on the seabed and ocean floor, makes no provision for the transfer of technology to other countries and to the international organ that is called upon to control the seabed mining of mineral resources. This law naturally places the developing countries in the worst possible position.

During the last session the American representatives at the conference made an attempt to introduce into the draft international convention of the Law of the Sea changes that would have accorded with their political ambitions and the laws of private enterprise. However, the overwhelming majority of participants in the UN Conference on the Law of the Sea rejected the U.S. solicitations and, against U.S. wishes, 130 countries recommended signing the international convention on the Law of the Sea. Only four states voted against the convention, the United States and Israel among them.

AUSTRIAN DAILY INTERVIEWS CPSU'S ZAGLADIN

AU211700 Vienna ARBEITER-ZEITUNG in German 21 May 21 82 p 4

[Manfred Scheuch, ARBEITER-ZEITUNG editor in chief, interview with Vadim Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department in Vienna on 18 May2

[Text] Vadim Zagladin, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, is one of the most highranking experts on armament questions in the Soviet Union. Prof Zagladin visited Austria and on this occasion met Manfred Scheuch, editor in chief of the daily ARBEITER-ZEITUNG on Tuesday 18 May. This happened on the same day that Brezhnev addressed the Komsomol congress and gave his positive reply to Reagan's proposal on talks about strategic disarmament. This event was a good opportunity for the following interview.

Question: Mr Zagladin, do you see in President Reagan's recent proposal a basic change in the attitude of the U.S. administration as compared to previous months?

Answer: Today we merely know that there is a proposal on President Reagan's part, and as Comrade Brezhnev stated today, this is a positive trend. We agree to begin with this change. Whether this is a really basic change has to be seen in the future. The positive aspect of President Reagan's speech and of the letter he wrote to Brezhnev can be interpreted as follows: This was a peaceful speech. For a year Reagan has only been speaking about war; now he is speaking about peace. This is a very positive factor in itself. Naturally, I cannot understand why he is talking simultaneously about U.S. armaments. I do hope, however, that there will be negotiations by the end of June 1982. This can already be considered a very positive development.

Question: How do you see the role of West European countries in this respect? Do you think that the West European governments have a chance to exert an influence on the summit talks?

Answer: Naturally, the European governments have many opportunities to contribute to this process. I think they have a great role to play, but to say West European countries is a much too generalized definition. There are different countries. If we refer to Austria, for example, this country played a role despite the fact that it is neutral. We highly appreciate the policy conducted by your government and by Federal Chancellor Kreisky. We are convinced that Austria will further pursue this policy of peace and detente.

As for the other West European countries, let us hope that they will play the same role. Stands are different, however. London, for example, takes one stand and Bonn quite a different one. Bonn has played a great role in the past. We believe that the FRG could play a greater role than it actually does. I am convinced that this new atmosphere will give new opportunities to the European countries.

Question: The peace movement is expanding in European countries and has recently been intensified. The majority of this movement demands that both superpowers should disarm. There is frequent talk about the fact that peace movements of this kind are unwelcome in the Soviet Union and in other East European countries. What do you think about this?

Answer: Two questions deserve two answers: First of all, we highly appreciate the peace movement as an expression of the people's will to prevent war. We understand this and we would like to support this cause and this will. We also consider it very important that this movement should not be a one-sided movement, limited to one party. Everyone is there and everyone can speak up -- there are differences of opinions on certain problems, but there is unanimity as regards the main problem -- peace. This is very important.

The second question regarding our stand: We also have a mass peace movement, but it expresses itself in other forms. We also have demonstrations. There was one on 9 May. We have demonstrations on the sites of war monuments, but they are demonstrations against war and in favor of peace. Or let us take another example: Our young people are now writing letters to Brussels, to the NATO organizations. Over 6 million youths have written such letters. Although 9 May was an official holiday, several working brigades came to work and collected all the money they had earned for the Soviet peace fund.

Question: What did they do with the money?

They have several peace committees for European security. They are printing newspapers, and all Soviet participants in peace demonstrations here in Vienna, Amsterdam or Brussels are being paid with the money from this fund. This is no state-owned money. I think that we do not inform the public sufficiently about our peace movement. From time to time it is stated that this peace movement should not be one-sided. We agree with this. We do not demand that the Americans alone or NATO alone should disarm. No, we say that both sides should disarm. Both the NATO member-countries as well as the Warsaw Pact Treaty member-countries and both the USSR as well as the United States should disarm. We are against all missiles, not only U.S. ones. We would like to propose that all missiles be eliminated. In today's speech Comrade Brezhnev stated that first of all we have already started reducing missiles, and in the second place, that we will not deploy any new missiles capable of reaching Europe.

When we proposed that all missiles should be destroyed, we were told that this is too much. When we proposed to destroy as many as 300 they told us that this is not enough. All right, we are ready to search for another idea in cooperation with the other side. This means that we have no one-sided idea about disarmament. Our ideas were unmistakably expressed at our last party congress: Soviet security is the security of Europe as well, and the security of Europe is our own security.

Question: The peace movement here in Europe has a very pronounced pacifist character. Pacifism, however, is always rejected in your publications. Is there not an essential contradiction between the two peace movements?

Answer: There are differences of opinions as regards pacifism. You can find publications in the Soviet Union where pacifism is criticized and certain others where it is supported. Personally, I think that the pacifism that existed before World War I and the one existing today are two entirely different matters. Pacifism prior to World War I was an abstract concept, whereas pacifists today are people who are against nuclear war. The character of war has thoroughly changed.

Question: You are talking about the peace movement, against nuclear war. There are, however, people who say that if there are no nuclear weapons, Western Europe would be defenseless against the Soviet superiority in armored cars, tanks and all other conventional weapons.

Answer: As far as I know, there are now numerous programs on disarmament, not only as regards nuclear weapons but also as regards conventional ones. We are ready to implement such programs; however, we have participated for a long as 9 years in the Vienna negotiations on this subject and no success has been achieved in this respect. I do not know why this is so. We have made a great step in this respect, such as our proposal to reduce as many as 1,000 tanks, but our proposal was not supported. We are ready to talk and to negotiate as well as to begin this so-called "conventional" disarmament.

Question: How is the situation in Poland assessed in the Soviet Union today since the most recent events in May have shown that there is still a strong movement against martial law in that country?

Answer: This is by no means a movement against martial law, but a movement against the government and partly against socialism, and there is nothing new about this. The events which have occurred in Poland since December 1981 represent the reaction of the government and the people's majority against the attempts to liquidate the socialist regime in Poland. It is quite obvious that such attempts have not stopped. They will continue, and all the events that happened in May were forecast by RFE. The schedules, the meeting places and the actions were all determined in advance and were very well organized. Such attempts will continue also in the future. There is nothing new about this.

We must, however, also consider the situation on the other side. We must adopt a realistic approach in evaluating this situation. There have been many changes in Poland during the aforementioned period, changes which have exerted a positive impact on the situation of the country. The fact, for example, that coal deliveries for Austria have now been resumed is very positive. This is a promising factor as well. These deliveries had been resumed again, because the government is functioning and because the workers class is working again. I think that this normalization of life will be pursued in Poland and will even be accelerated.

Question: Our federal president is leaving for the Soviet Union next week. Do you think he has a chance in making it possible that a summit meeting should take place in Vienna?

Answer: I do not know, because this does not depend solely upon us. Austria, however, has done a great deal in this respect. It has contributed to peace, to meetings and to negotiations, and this is a great credit which your country deserves. As to the visit of your federal president to the USSR, we have good ideas in this respect and I think that the negotiations will be interesting. We are convinced that cooperation between our two countries is promising in all sectors -- in the economic, political and cultural fields, as well.

TASS ISSUES STATEMENT ON FALKLANDS SITUATION

LD231650 Moscow TASS in English 1640 GMT 23 May 82

["TASS Statement" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 23 May, TASS -- Britain has made a massive attack on the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands with the use of warplanes, warships and landing troops. Heavy fighting is under way in the area of the islands between the armed forces of Britain and Argentina, with both sides sustaining considerable losses. Thus, the conflict over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands has taken a new dangerous turn.

There is no doubt that Britain bears responsibility for the situation that arose around the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. For many years Britain has been stubbornly opposing the implementation of the U.N. decisions on decolonisation and on a peace settlement of the dispute with Argentina over sovereignty over those islands.

Since the very beginning of the conflict, Britain, that made stake on the armed force, sent to the area of the South Atlantic a naval armada and unleashed military actions against Argentina.

The British side has been blocking up the recent efforts to prevent a military confrontation.

Britain now turns down negotiations at all, while the Government of Argentina stands for continued negotiations. This refusal from negotiations cannot be justified, no matter how one assesses the causes of the conflict. London tries through the force of arms to restore the colonial status of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, thus challenging the world community which unconditionally denounced and turned down colonialism.

The British armed invasion of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands imperils international peace and security, it runs counter to the U.N. Charter, to the basic norms of international law.

The responsibility for that is also borne by those states, above all the United States, which associated themselves with the British stand, which openly sided with London and thereby actually encouraged it for a military solution of the conflict. The confident opinion in the Soviet Union is that no matter how different are the stands of the sides on the substance of the conflict, disputable issues between them should be ironed out by peaceful means, by negotiations. Even long negotiations are better than a short war.

Expressing anxiety over the dangerous development of events around the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, the Soviet leading circles denounce Britain's use of military force. An immediate end should be put to the bloodshed. Undelayed efforts, including within the framework of the United Nations, are necessary to settle the Anglo-Argentine dispute through negotiations.

MOSCOW CITES BRITISH DAILY ON FALKLANDS INVASION

LD212030 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 21 May 82

[Commentary by Valeriy Belyanskiy]

[Text] In the South Atlantic, British naval forces have launched a broad operation to seize the Falkland Islands. The order of the so-called War Cabinet to the British expeditionary corps to assault the Falkland Islands has not come as a surprise for anybody. In recent days, both at the meetings of the British Parliament and in the London press, so much was said about the inevitable slide into war in the conflict with Argentina that the announcement to this effect was expected at any hour.

Basing her bellicosity, Mrs Thatcher repeatedly said that time is running out and that the search for a diplomatic solution to the Anglo-Argentine conflict had been exhausted. [sentence as heard] But is it true that time had run out and that a peaceful solution to the crisis was not possible? In United Nations circles, the failure of the mediating mission of the secretary general of the United Nations, Javier Perez de Cuellar, is linked with the stand of Britain, which from the very beginning of the talks steered a course to resolve the issue with Argentina by military force.

The GUARDIAN a few days ago wrote that the head of the British Government has made use in her statements of such expressions which certainly must rouse doubts at the United Nations while a search for a possible diplomatic settlement is continuing. The government, the paper continues, is practically doing everything to strengthen the opinion that the British expeditionary corps is making the last arrangements for an armed seizure of the Falkland Islands.

Now, following the beginning of the storming of the islands, one can properly assess what the GUARDIAN has said and what one of Mrs Thatcher's assistants said after a meeting of the War Cabinet; and he said that an invasion would be carried out as soon as Britain was ready for it. Such statements give reason to believe that London has played at negotiations only to gain time to concentrate enough forces and enlist enough American support to strike a decisive blow.

But, aside from the military aspect, the British Government's decision to storm the Falklands has political and economic aspects. Keeping the naval task force thousands of miles from Britain is a heavy burden -- and according to latest estimates the cost is approaching 1,000 million pounds -- and it can have dire consequences for the crisis-ridden British economy.

Pandemonium has already broken out at Britain's stock exchanges; the pound is falling down and so are the stocks of British companies. This is a result of Britain's strained relations with its partners in the EEC, which don't appear very enthusiastic about supporting the Falklands adventure.

Moreover, Mrs Thatcher's bellicose course does not by far enjoy unqualified support in the British Parliament itself, and even within the Conservative Party. Mrs Thatcher may still be finding some inspiration in compliments like those of Winston Churchill's grandson, who said that if he were prime minister today Winston Churchill would have responded with the same military power being used by the prime minister, Margaret Thatcher, to resolve the Falkland Islands dispute. But can Mrs Thatcher find any inspiration in the history of the collapse of the British empire, a collapse which Winston Churchill chaired though, as he said, he'd rather have not?

The GUARDIAN recently remarked that at a certain price and with luck the Falklands Islands can be recaptured, but the future of the colony would still remain indefinite. The paper is probably correct, and if it is Mrs Thatcher, by issuing the order to storm the islands, sent her countrymen to die solely for her nostalgia for the past.

BRITONS' VIEW OF ANGLO-ARGENTINE CONFLICT

LD222322 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 22 May 82

[Report from London by correspondent Vitaliy Ilyashenko]

[Text] It used to be thought that circumspection and common sense were typical of British politicians. In no way can you say that about the present Conservative government. The Tories are obsessed with the urge to return the Falkland Islands to the British crown at all costs. These islands were seized from Argentina during the 19th century in a period of colonial annexation.

While the search for a peaceful solution to the crisis was still continuing at the UN, Prime Minister Thatcher was declaring: Our proposals are no longer on the table. The navy was ordered to seize the archipelago. British forces landed on the islands and commenced armed operations. This means, effectively, that Britain has begun an undeclared war against Argentina.

The armed conflict has entered a dangerous new stage and nobody can now forecast its consequences. Speaking to reporters at the entrance to her residence, Prime Minister Thatcher hastened to extol the success of the British Tommies, while the Ministry of Defense discreetly kept silent as to the number of British youths who died during the landing.

Already now, the wave of protests against the widening of the armed conflict in the South Atlantic by the Conservative government is growing in the country. More and more people here are beginning to realize that the war with Argentina over the Falklands has nothing to do with the interests of the British people. It is being conducted for the sake of the economic and strategic interests of the British ruling circles.

That war and its outcome, the MORNING STAR writes, are only important for Thatcher and the Tory Party and it essential to stop the war immediately.

BRITAIN'S PROBLEMS IN FALKLANDS, EEC EXAMINED

LD212304 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2010 GMT 21 May 82

[From the "International Diary" program with Vitaliy Sobolev]

[Text] As AFP reports, today and Sunday an increase in the British squadron's military activity against the Argentine troops on the Falklands (Malvinas) Islands is expected. The assault is being carried out by means of a long and increasing series of landings on the less protected sectors. In London they are talking about a war of attrition.

It is still early to say how far the British will succeed, but the first landings have already shown that this tactical approach will not safeguard the British from losses. One of the assault helicopters crashed and 21 people died. This means that according to the British figures, the number of dead in the conflict was immediately doubled, although nothing is yet known about losses in the serious clashes.

Observers believe that the change in British tactics is caused by the fact that London fears a negative reaction from public opinion among its allies if the general assault causes heavy bloodshed. This means there is hope that the adverse results of the first landings will force the Conservative government to have second thoughts, and to turn to the only sensible means -- talks. The Argentine authorities consider that this path is not yet closed. Although there has been a hitch in the efforts of the UN secretary general, a new initiative has been made by the Peruvian Government.

And at the same time, the situation has worsened for the conservatives on another front: in how the settle with their West European allies. The London paper STANDARD has reported that Margaret Thatcher held consultations with her senior government ministers to discuss possible options for a response to the measures of the European Economic Community, which as is known, has refused to review the size of the British payments into the community's budget, and has raised the prices for agricultural products, regardless of the British veto.

This step is viewed in the British Government as a stab in the back. The present split in the Common Market, as it is viewed in London, could have more serious consequences than even the conflict with Argentina. London's fury, as the agency describes its reaction, is exacerbated by the fact that the allies are maintaining sanctions against Argentina with great reluctance, and then not all of them and for a short period.

The allies are now, as British television reports from Brussels, afraid that Britain will retaliate by stopping its payments into the Common Market budget. The ruling circles of France have expressed readiness to review Britain's status in this association. The European community is on the threshold of the most dangerous crisis in the entire history of its existence. This is how BBC television evaluates the situation.

U.S. AID TO BRITAIN CITED AS 'IMPERIALIST'

LD240652 Moscow TASS in English 0625 GMT 24 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 24 May, TASS -- A military outbreak in the South Atlantic has again demonstrated that not the invented "Soviet military threat" but an aggressive foreign policy of imperialism, especially clearly manifesting itself in the actions of the United States and Britain both of which play the first fiddle in NATO, that constitutes a real threat to universal peace, Vitaliy Korionov writes today, commenting on the invasion of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands by British troops. Touching on the so-called mediation effort by the United States in the British-Argentine conflict, the news analyst stresses that it lasted for as long as it took Britain's admiralty to lead its task force to the archipelago and to take it into a circle of iron.

After that Washington cast off the guise of a mediator, in effect joining in the struggle against Argentina, supplying British troops with fuel, tanker planes, military equipment, ammunition and intelligence. It has been proved once again. As soon as it comes to retaining hold of the regions, potentially important for the monopolies, strategically or economically, imperialist solidarity at once comes into the fore.

However, this is "solidarity" of the kind when everyone is trying to cut into the pie. Let us recall: One of the first proposals of Haig, the "mediator", was to hoist over the disputed islands the U.S. national flag alongside those of Britain and Argentina.

The conflict in the South Atlantic has once again demonstrated the sinister role of NATO which uses it not only as a test range of modern sea warfare but also as an additional pretext for intensifying the arms race.

In connection with the conflict, the imperialist essence of Washington's policy with respect to Latin American states has been reaffirmed once again, the news analyst writes.

U.S. imperialism, teaming up with British imperialism, in actual fact hopes to teach all developing nations a "lesson", as it were, saying: What happened to Argentina today may happen to any other country tomorrow. Imperialism, the Argentine weekly QUE PASA writes, is trying to "punish a people who is defending its sovereignty" by way of a lesson to others.

MOSCOW CALLS U.S. DOCUMENT 'DISHONEST'

PY221542 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 0000 GMT 22 May 82

[Text] The U.S. Embassy in Buenos Aires has published a document giving U.S. interpretation of the position advocated by the mass information media of the Soviet Union in relation to the Anglo-Argentine conflict. In this regard, our commentator Vyacheslav Rostovtsev wrote the following article:

The final sentence of the document reveals the spirit of the document. It says: The Soviet information media continues to use the crisis of the Malvinas Islands as a propaganda effort to hurt U.S. relations with Latin America and at the same time to improve Soviet links with the countries of the area.

As a result of this statement, I would like to point out three aspects: First of all, what do the Soviet press, radio and television have to do with it? The United States alone damaged its relations with Latin America by supporting Great Britain which by the use of force is putting into practice its colonialist voracity.

It was not a Soviet daily but the New York TIMES which said that the United States, by supporting Great Britain, has created serious problems for the inter-American system. The same newspaper indicated that the U.S. position in the conflict over the Malvinas/Falkland Islands is considered to be treason to the Latin American countries. Never in its history has the United States carried out so many hasty actions to destroy its prestige in Latin America. These remarks were not made by a Soviet weekly but by TIME, the U.S. magazine.

Second, the U.S. diplomats in Buenos Aires said in the document that the Soviet mass information media, by illustrating the events in the South Atlantic from premeditated anti-U.S. positions, are trying to improve its relations with the Latin American countries at U.S. expense.

This clearly shows an effort aimed at distorting and damaging the principles of Soviet foreign policy. Our country has always been and continues to be against colonialism and imperialism. Naturally, this policy as well as the Soviet position in relation to the methods for solving situations of conflict is also understood in Latin America. Conflicts must be solved through peaceful means at the negotiations table.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize the following: The document published by the U.S. diplomatic mission is apparently also aimed at exercising psychological pressure on Argentine and Latin American public opinion in general. Obviously this is due to the fact that Washington's open pro-British position in the conflict has created a strong anti-U.S. feeling in Latin America. The objective of this dishonest document is to deviate the anti-U.S. feeling by stirring up anti-Sovietism.

PINOCHET TAKES PRO-BRITISH POSITION, GIVES AID

PY211102 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Spanish to Latin America 0130 GMT 21 May 82

[Text] The Pinochet gang has taken a pro-British position over the Malvinas problem [words indistinct]. There are reports that a Chilean tanker is helping the British fleet in the South Atlantic and that British transport planes are using Easter Island. The British naval air force is getting fuel supplies in Chilean depots. [words indistinct] Officers are operating in Punta Arenas and in the Strait of Magellan.

The Pinochet regime is also creating radio interference in the Argentine military liaison system. Pinochet and his generals increased their pro-British actions after the United States with impudence supported London in the conflict in the South Atlantic. We should recall that Chile has repeatedly stated its ambition over a considerable zone of the Atlantic and has even tried to demonstrate its rights over the Malvinas.

The question now arises: Has Pinochet received from London and Washington promises of a part of Argentine territory in return for his jealous participation in support of the aggression against Argentina?

Immediately after the Anglo-Argentine confrontation started, the London daily THE GUARDIAN published reports of attacks by the Chilean Army through Andean ports in Patagonia, using to their advantage for this purpose their agents among the local citizens of Chilean descent. According to the newspaper, this type of action would be very useful for the British.

Some Western observers are already saying that the Argentine-Chilean border is virtually a second front. In this regard, it is worth recalling [words indistinct] that military conflicts have taken place among South American countries in the past due to (?British) voracity. The Chaco war is an example. Great Britain is an old and wicked enemy of the Latin American people and it is now acting with the (?support) of its partners [word indistinct] through NATO and the United States.

The felony of the Chilean regime can be understood because the yankee imperialists are behind it. Precisely the CIA was responsible for putting Pinochet in power and it is doing everything to strengthen this puppet of the U.S. industrial military complex in the South Atlantic. It is also not surprising to see that the Chilean junta strongly supports the idea of creating the South Atlantic Treaty Organization, SATO. In this regard, Chile and South Africa may have great influence [word indistinct] under the orders of the Pentagon.

It is symptomatic that the UK also has an outstanding place in this plan in exchange for setting up a large SATO base in the Malvinas. [Words indistinct] strengthen its links with Pinochet. The British are dying to see Argentina fighting on two fronts.

ROME PAPER CITES MOSCOW SOURCES ON U.S.

PM201511 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 18 May 82 pp 1, 15

[Sandro Viola dispatch: "Moscow Satisfied: Reagan Changing"]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 17 May -- It is disconcerting at first. Why are there so many relaxed faces to be seen in Moscow offices when one goes to talk with the "nomenklatura" men (a member of the PRAVDA editorial staff or a staff general, a brilliant economist at the Academy of Sciences or an eminent Central Committee member)? Yet, as we all know, the USSR is experiencing a period of profound difficulties. Maneuvers for the succession (this "terrible struggle under the carpet," as Churchill called it) are indeed fully underway; economic anxieties are becoming more and more inextricably entangled; and at the same time the latest news from Warsaw (unrest among the citizens and rampant militarization) is definitely bad. So why are people so calm? The explanation is simple. Though the USSR's internal problems (the internal problems of the "socialist community" -- Poland and Romania's galloping crisis) are indeed still numerous and alarming, on the other hand, the international situation has experienced a semi-turnabout in the past 30-40 days.

Almost everything has changed in the USSR's favor. The proceedings initiated against Moscow following the proclamation of martial law in Poland have now been shelved. Who talks about Soviet responsibilities or sanctions any more? "Don't quote me," I was told by an old acquaintance who holds a prominent position in Soviet journalism, "otherwise people will say that we want to interfere in relations between Europeans and Americans. But it would be a good thing for the Europeans to bear in mind what has happened. The Americans, who even just a couple a months ago were angrily pressing for the abandonment of the European-USSR accords for the Siberian gas pipeline, are now negotiating 1982-83 grain sales with us. The negotiations have already started in Paris and I have very precise information about how they are proceeding. Well, I can tell you that we are being offered the best conditions -- on the mode and timetable of payment -- for the past 6-7 years."

Unexpected Luck

Meanwhile in the past month the Falklands conflict has emerged -- an unexpected piece of luck for the Kremlin, a windfall. The American hemisphere is in turmoil. There are rifts in the Atlantic front, there has been the demonstration of the impotence of U.S. diplomacy and a limitless field of observation for Soviet military espionage. Moscow has confronted all this with a display of caution and equilibrium, noting (it can be imagined with what pleasure) that over the Falklands, for the first time in years, China has adopted a stance identical to the USSR's.

Last, in barely a month, there has been the Reagan swing. A "yes" to the summit proposed a year ago by Moscow; a "yes" to strategic arms negotiations; a "yes" (implicit) to the old Soviet thesis that only comprehensive U.S.-USSR negotiations can prevent a deterioration of the international situation. Together with these "yesses" there have been a number of equally significant "noes." No more anathemas against communism, not another word about "linkage," farewell to the idea of using "economic leverage" or economic pressures for securing certain kinds of international behavior from the USSR.

It is a complete turnabout and another Reagan. "Henry" Trofimenko [of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada] (the most popular Soviet Americanologist in the United States) smiled politely: "What can I tell you.... It seems that Reagan too, like Ford and Carter, is only now learning, at the White House, what it means to govern a major power these days. Of course it took him some time, but it now really does seem that his political education is proceeding as it should...."

I sought an explanation of the factors to which the U.S. change of course is attributed and heard a chorus of praise for the Europeans' "realism." In the new PRAVDA building (at last: They had been working on it for 4 years) I spoke with Deputy Chief Editor Grigoryev, who is in charge of the foreign policy pages. Grigorev is someone who irritates me from time to time with his obsession with propaganda, and he irritated me this time. "You know, I have received some fine letters from a factory in Tataria. The workers wrote me: Does Reagan want to manufacture the 'N' bomb? Well, we will respond by increasing our output by 10 percent." But when he stopped talking this nonsense he did have some interesting things to say.

"The most prominent political event in recent months has in fact been the absence of consensus between the U.S. administration and the European allies. We have clearly seen in Europe the apprehension with regard to the Reagan line and have followed most attentively the attempts made to attenuate the ideological rigidities of that line. And frankly, we never seriously believed that the theory held by Weinberger, who pressed for a Western economic blockade against the USSR, would prevail. We knew that had such a thesis prevailed, it would have created very major difficulties for the European economies. We knew that following the fruitful experience of the major economic exchanges of the seventies, it would have been virtually impossible for the Europeans to turn back...."

"Henry" Trofimenko agrees about the "realism" of the U.S. allies (who, he said, "did not allow the sanctions policy to be imposed on them") and when I visited [CPSU International Relations Section Deputy Chief] Vadim Zagladin at the Central Committee Secretariat headquarters, he too stressed the "moderating role" of "certain European governments." "Certain European governments" means mainly Bonn and Chancellor Schmidt, so when I want to ask one of my Moscow interlocutors an unpleasant question say: "Will Schmidt manage to survive or is the Social Democratic era about to end?" Then I see their faces cloud over and soon enough they reply: "He should last through the next elections. Then we shall see, of course, But who could expect another Strauss-style chancellor in the FRG?"

"Essential to Negotiate"

As for the prospects for the dialogue with the United States, it is too early to say whether it will be easy or difficult, fruitful or otherwise. But as I have said, what counts for Moscow is a U.S. acknowledgement that an understanding between the superpowers is indispensable. General Lebedev, a staff missiles expert, stupefied me for an hour with calculations about warheads and vehicles, arguing that the U.S. proposals are now unacceptable. "On the other hand," he concluded, "the essential thing is to negotiate. When we were negotiating SALT II we seemed far apart too, but we eventually did reach an agreement."

PRAVDA HITS U.S. CONCEPT OF NATIONAL INTEREST

PM201345 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 82 p 6

[M. Vasilyev article: "Real and Imaginary National Interests"]

[Text] When he headed the Cabinet British Field Marshal Wellington, who was well known in the last century, was indignant at his civilian colleagues: "I gave them orders, and they started discussing them." This story is recalled today by American political commentators describing Washington's grumbling about the behavior of its NATO partners and also of those developing countries which the United States numbers among its "friends."

These complaints emphasize particularly insistently that in their pursuit of advantages "of the moment" the leadership and the public in countries which are U.S. allies fail to understand "their states" real national interests" and all but betray "the West's highest ideals," by which Washington is said to be guided.

What does all this rhetoric conceal?

References to "national interests" in a class society have traditionally served as a handy expedient to justify particular foreign policy actions. What the ruling class has understood by this, as a rule, is its own interests, passing them off as general interests, to use Marx' well-known expression. At the same time it would probably be a simplification to think that a reference to national interests when determining a political course has always been merely an empty and hypocritical stunt. There is no doubt, for example, that when General De Gaulle called for a struggle against the occupiers in the tragic days of June 1940 in the name of France's national interests, this call really expressed the interests of the entire French nation. Equally, if we take the same historical period, Roosevelt's statements in favor of rebuffing the Axis powers reflected the American people's interests.

How precisely, then, does the present American administration perceive U.S. national interests, and how do they correspond to the state of affairs in the world?

Here is a statement by U.S. Secretary of State Haig: "The highest American national interests are simple and immutable: We want to have a world community well-disposed toward our society and our general ideals." Another example. According to Under Secretary of State Buckley, "The present administration understands U.S. interests differently to its predecessors.... We Americans cannot escape the responsibilities associated with our leading role in the world, nor the burden which they impose on us."

Statements of this sort show quite clearly just what is involved in the concept of "U.S. national interests." It is not a question of striving, on the basis of recognizing the realities of the existing world, for better mutual understanding and trust among various countries and for the removal of the danger of war. No, the task has been set of imposing "American-style order" on other countries and peoples. In a world which seems ideal to the leaders of American policy there must be no place for coexistence on equal terms among countries with different social systems, and other centers of power, apart from the United States, are not permitted within the framework of Western society itself.

Of course, this does not mean that American policymakers believe that this situation is on the point of being achieved. Clearly, neither the situation in the world nor the means at the United States' disposal make this possible. Something else is important -- a long-term guideline, surrounded with the halo of "defense of national interests," is being put forward for all American foreign policy.

Here the claims to world leadership "in the name of national interests" are combined with championing the egoistic needs of American business.

The theme of the intensification of disagreements between the United States and its partners is being discussed widely in both the American and the European press. Here, however, the matter frequently boils down to emphasizing the differences in the characters of particular leaders of the Western world or pointing up the inexperience or lack of tact of the American leadership. However, the crux of the matter is that, while general class positions coincide, the line being pursued by the United States under the flag of its national interests objectively clashes with the real vital interests of American allies.

These disagreements embrace a wide range of problems. The NATO partners approach questions of detente differently. Whereas, according to Haig's statement, the policy of detente "does not accord with U.S. interests," European leaders emphasize their interest in continuing it. Tindemans, the present head of the EEC Council of Ministers, declared that "for Europeans detente has become part of their life." And this stand is borne out by weighty economic arguments.

It is known that West Europe's commodity turnover with the CEMA countries, which totaled approximately \$60 billion in 1980, is 10 times in excess of U.S. commodity turnover with the socialist community states. Trade with the East guarantees West Europe 2 million jobs -- a substantial factor under conditions of growing unemployment.

But, of course, it is not just a matter of economics, however important this might be. Europe's very situation, being located, as it were, in the front line in the event of any East-West confrontation, makes it far more sensitive to the possible consequences of a dangerous U.S. policy. As London's International Institute for Strategic Studies stated in its report, "For 30 years the NATO alliance engendered a feeling of the coincidence of interests on both sides of the Atlantic. At the beginning of the new decade this coincidence of interests became less obvious. The general worsening of the state of detente made Europeans realize the obvious fact that, by virtue of their geographic situation, they are more interested than the United States in an absence of disagreements in central Europe."

The specific peculiarity of the West European countries' present position is that, because of Atlantic discipline and, in the final analysis, class commonality of interests, the leaders of these countries show solidarity with Washington in pursuing, say, the NATO "arms upgrading" policy and in mounting a bitter anti-Polish campaign which is jeopardizing the development of all-European cooperation. However, every significant step on this path gives rise to considerable alarm and misgivings in the same leaders, not to mention the public, as it runs counter to their countries' obvious national interests.

Of course, differences in interests embrace not only the sphere of "East-West" relations. They are also quite palpable in the zone of developing countries, particularly in the region of the Near and Middle East. For Washington military-strategic tasks have come to the fore in this region. But West European countries and Japan are vitally interested in preserving peace in this region -- one of the chief sources of their energy supplies. This is why U.S. policy arouses their natural concern.

On the whole, it would probably be no exaggeration to say that the clearly expressed U.S. great-power policy is giving rise to a counterwave of anti-American feeling in the U.S. allies. Although this feeling is now being written about most frequently in the FRG, it is also taking hold of other Western countries. Luxembourg's foreign minister, for example, deemed it appropriate to point out: "Washington's ignoring of West European countries' vital interests could lead to a confrontation between the United States and its partners."

Of course, these feelings cannot fail to be noticed in the United States. What, then, is the response? Naturally, official Washington tries to conceal the depth of the problem with feigned optimism. Extreme rightwing circles demand unilateral action by the United States "in the name of national interests," paying no attention to their Western allies "if the need arises." Thus, at a seminar held in Washington by the American Employers Institute at the beginning of this year the American political scientist (Kristoll) tried to prove that the United States must act alone whenever its national interests are affected, placing emphasis on the system of bilateral relations instead of NATO. Similar voices were also heard at the so-called "Conservative Political Action Conference" held in the American capital at the end of February and organized by the leadership of the rightwing trend in the U.S. Congress. This is an extreme viewpoint, so to speak, however, its reflection can be perceived in the views of Defense Secretary Weinberger, who recommends ignoring the stance of West European countries in their approach, say, to the problem of relations with the USSR.

A different trend is also apparent in American sociopolitical circles. They are asking whether the policy which the United States is trying to pursue at the present time accords with its real interests.

The fact that the present administration regards confrontation with the USSR as of paramount importance "may harm our national interests in the long term," Senate Democratic Leader Byrd believes, for example.

It is symptomatic in this connection that almost at the same time a sizable group of American congressmen put forward a draft resolution for a total freeze on the "testing, production and further deployment of nuclear warheads, missiles and other delivery systems" as a starting point for their further reduction. Senator E. Kennedy, one of the authors of this draft, pointed out that this proposal has been advanced precisely because it is "in the interests of U.S. national security."

Finally, an article in FOREIGN AFFAIRS is also significant in this respect. It is by Kennan, Bundy, McNamara and Smith -- figures who played a key role in shaping U.S. military-strategic doctrine and who are now calling for the renunciation of its chief provision -- the "right" to the first use of nuclear weapons. The whole article is permeated with the idea that a nuclear war under conditions when the United States no longer has nuclear superiority cannot accord with American national interests.

The American administration's reaction boils down, above all, to the fact that Washington is still seeking to upset the military-strategic equilibrium which has come about in the world, reducing America's national interests once again to achieving military superiority. But this prospect is arousing all the more skepticism both in Europe and on the other side of the Atlantic.

Critics of the present U.S. policy believe that the principle of achieving a dominant U.S. position in the world, without regard for actual reality, in fact threatens the vital interests of the entire West.

The stand of the peoples of Western states is a tremendously important factor influencing the sentiments inside these countries' ruling groupings. The unprecedented scale of the antimilitarist movement in Europe is having an effect on governments, forcing them sometimes to oppose the hegemonist U.S. policy and to come out in defense of detente and for arms limitation. A movement of this kind is also developing in the United States itself. There is no doubt that resistance to Washington's dangerous course will spread.

To reinterpret the system of priorities in foreign policy and elaborate a different, more realistic policy which would really accord with the long-term interests of both the United States and the European partners and the real interests of their peoples -- this is the task being advanced increasingly frequently both by the public and by realistically-minded representatives of Western countries' ruling circles as the hopelessness of the American administration's present policy becomes clear.

The major new initiatives advanced in L.I. Brezhnev's speeches confront the American ruling circles still more clearly with a dilemma: to continue the policy of an unlimited arms buildup or, proceeding from America's real interests, as well as the interests of international security as a whole, finally to embark on a serious dialogue on the problem of limiting and reducing nuclear arms on the principles of the sides' equality and identical security.

BEIJING NOT INTERESTED IN IMPROVING RELATIONS

OW240315 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 1100 GMT 23 May 82

[Glebov commentary: "A Marked Card in Beijing Militarists' Hands"]

[Text] Do Beijing leaders wish to ease tension in Sino-Soviet relations? I am not raising this question by chance. The fact is that my understanding has been obscured by the Beijing leaders' recent statements on Sino-Soviet relations. For example, in his talks with a Japanese delegation several days ago, Zhao Ziyang said Beijing did not oppose the normalization of Sino-Soviet relations. However, the Chinese premier said: We have to take note of the Soviet deeds first as a base on which to judge the Soviet stand. What did the Chinese premier mean by Soviet deeds? The materials published in Chinese newspapers have not left any doubt in this respect. Beijing leaders indicated that the Soviet Union must fulfill a number of preconditions before they could agree to hold talks in Beijing on normalizing Sino-Soviet relations. They demanded precisely that the Soviet Union must forsake fundamental principles in Soviet foreign policy, for example, Beijing leaders wanted our country to abandon our fraternal cooperation with Socialist Vietnam and the Mongolian People's Republic. Beijing leaders also asked the Soviet Union not in any way show Beijing's wish to normalize Sino-Soviet relations. By the way, capitalist newspapers in the West have assessed Beijing's stand on this basis. The New York TIMES wrote: Beijing authorities have put forward obviously unacceptable conditions, giving Moscow the hint that they do not wish to improve relations.

A logical question we should raise in this connection is: Why do Beijing leaders want to maintain tension in Sino-Soviet relations and what can they gain from this situation? There can be no simple answer to this question as it involves the various aspects of Beijing's policies. However, I would like to ask friends to pay attention to this point: Following Mao Zedong's teaching, the Deng Xiaoping clique is stepping up China's militarization plan by every means, above all, the programs in rocketry and nuclear armament. To this end, China is spending nearly half the state budget.

To defend this most wasteful policy among the exhausted Chinese laboring people, bedeviled by poverty and hardship, Beijing leaders have been using the myth of a "military threat from the Soviet Union," a myth concocted by imperialists and grasped firmly by Mao Zedong when he was living. They are using this myth to intimidate the Chinese people, making them believe that China must arm itself for self-defense and to resist the inevitable Soviet attack. Judge for yourselves. Is there any advantage for Beijing leaders to normalize Sino-Soviet relations under these circumstances? Of course not. We should realize that any change in Sino-Soviet relations that brings about renewed good neighborliness between China and the Soviet Union would ruin Beijing's militaristic design, hidden under the notorious cry of the "Soviet threat."

Dear listeners, in conclusion I would like to stress this point. The people in the Soviet Union long ago recognized the significance of improving Sino-Soviet relations as an established fact, because it is compatible with the fundamental interests of the Chinese and the Soviet people. We are confident that there is a realistic possibility of improving Sino-Soviet relations. Abandoning such a possibility, or ignoring it, would be running counter to the immediate interests of the Chinese and Soviet people as well as the interests of the people of various countries. The Soviet attitude toward China does not change according to circumstances, because it is in the interest of peace and the welfare of the people of various countries. There is every possibility of making Sino-Soviet relations a constructive factor in stabilizing the situation in the region and around the world. We hope that this possibility will be taken advantage of.

SOUTH KOREA ANNOUNCES CABINET RESHUFFLE

LD211050 Moscow TASS in English 0952 GMT 21 May 82

[Text] Tokyo, 21 May, TASS -- The South Korean dictator Chon Tu-hwan announced today the results of a new reshuffle of his puppet government: 11 new ministers, including ministers of defence, justice, trade and industry, have been appointed in his 22-member cabinet which is headed as before by Yu Chang-sun. The purpose behind the present reshuffle, made after the entire cabinet resigned on Thursday, is to allay the growing public discontent with the anti-people policy of the pro-American regime and the inability of Chon Tu-hwan and his clique to deal effectively with the country's acute economic and political problems.

Kharkov Analysis

LD211842 Moscow TASS in English 1540 GMT 21 May 82

["Seoul: A Regime in Crisis" -- TASS headline; by TASS news analyst Vasilii Kharkov]

[Text] Moscow, 21 May, TASS -- The head of the Seoul regime Chon Tu-hwan marked the second anniversary of his coming to power in a peculiar way. Today he made a major reshuffle in his cabinet, blaming it for a series of grave political and financial scandals which have rocked South Korea of late. True, the Seoul dictator replaced only a half of his cabinet ministers, leaving in place the premier, his deputy for economic affairs and the finance minister, who have reportedly been involved in the embezzlement of state funds.

Well, scapegoats have been found, one may say. By sacking several ministers and replacing them with new high-ranking army officers, Chon Tu-hwan would like to hush up the scandals in which the dictator's closest relatives are implicated, in a bid to assuage public indignation lest it should erupt into a second Kwangju.

Having demagogically proclaimed in May 1980 the onset of a "new era" in South Korea, Chon Tu-hwan tried to picture things in such a way as if his regime were undergoing a "liberalisation" of sorts. However, new anti-democratic laws adopted in South Korea in the past two years restricted even more severely the civil rights of the population, meagre as they are. Like before, everyone who is suspected of the slightest disloyalty to the regime is subjected to brutal reprisals. Foreign analysts agree that the people still live in the atmosphere of terror.

Chon Tu-hwan's another slogan proved to be no less demagogical. [sentence as received] He boasted that he would create a society of social justice. Over these two years corruption, stealing and bribery in the Seoul clique developed even further. A number of large-scale frauds which cost the Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars followed scandalous financial machinations in the Municipal Council of Seoul.

The so-called "purge" in the state machine started by the dictator in effect resulted in the ousting of persons who do not suit the regime for political reasons, while swindlers and embezzlers got an even greater freedom of action. And all this is happening at a time when social and economic problems of South Korea are rapidly getting worse against the backdrop of runaway inflation, growing unemployment, mass bankruptcies of small- and medium-scale businesses, an exorbitant foreign debt standing at a cool 32 billion dollars. In other words, the economy of South Korea is in the grip of a protracted depression. And still almost 40 per cent of the state budget are spent on military preparations.

The echo of the Kwangju uprising brutally quelled two years ago can still be heard in various parts of South Korea. Student demonstrations are mounting. Dissatisfaction is growing among intellectuals and inside the religious community. It also makes itself felt in a sharp increase in anti-American sentiment. The United States, writes the New York TIMES, runs into an unprecedented level of anti-Americanism in South Korea.

The current developments in South Korea bear witness to a deep-running crisis of the Seoul regime and the policy of its Washington benefactors.

USSR, INDIA SIGN SPACE RESEARCH AGREEMENT

LD221030 Moscow TASS in English 1020 GMT 22 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 22 May, TASS -- The Soviet Union will give India assistance in the fulfillment of its programme of space research planned for the 1980's. An agreement to this effect was signed here today between the Soviet Licensintorg foreign trade association and the Indian space research organisation. It provides for the launching of an Indian satellite for the remote probing of the earth in the mid-1980's.

In accordance with the agreement the sputnik, built by the Indian side, will be launched by the Soviet Union for the fulfillment of tasks set by India in the field of studying national natural wealth. The Indian space research organisation will build the sputnik while Licensintorg with the help of the International Council of the USSR Academy of Sciences and other Soviet organisations will carry out the work to ensure launching and provide the necessary services.

This is the first agreement under which Soviet organisations have provided their services on a commercial basis to a foreign partner in the field of the peaceful uses of outer space.

The signing of the contract is a result of twenty years of scientific and technological cooperation between Soviet and Indian scientists and specialists in the field of space research.

By now three Indian artificial satellites of the earth, designed and built with the participation of Soviet specialists, have been launched by Soviet carrier rockets. Joint experiments in the field of space meteorology are being held regularly.

MRS GANDHI TO VISIT USSR IN SEPTEMBER

LD221540 Moscow TASS in English 1458 GMT 22 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 22 May, TASS -- It has been agreed that the Prime Minister of the Republic of India Indira Gandhi will pay an official friendly visit to the USSR in September of this year at the invitation of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

SINO-INDIAN BORDER TALKS BEGIN IN DELHI

Ulov Commentary

BK230320 Moscow in Hindi to India 1400 GMT 15 May 82

[Andrey Ulov commentary]

[Text] From time to time the Chinese leaders talk about their desire to revive centuries old friendly ties with India. India for its part took steps long ago to normalize its relations with China and agreed to send representatives to the talks. The first round of talks was held in December last year. It is regrettable that the only outcome of those talks was, in the words of Indian External Affairs Minister Narasimha Rao, that talks were held. On the border issue, which prevents the normalization of Sino-Indian relations, China refused to budge an inch.

The new round of talks is to start shortly in New Delhi. The Chinese diplomats may now get some scope to extend proof of the assurances they have given to India. Instead of playing with words, China should have taken effective steps much earlier. According to Indian observers any preparations to return the Indian territory forcibly occupied at Aksai Chin in 1959 and 1962 would serve as the best manifestation of China's desire to end the stalemate in Sino-Indian relations.

Are the Chinese leaders ready for it? The answer to this question will be available from the talks. However, according to the UNITED NEWS OF INDIA, China has conveyed to India in a number of ways that as on earlier occasions it will adhere to the proposal of a package deal. The crux of the proposal is that China will continue to maintain its occupation of 36,000 kilometers of Indian territory in Aksai Chin in exchange for the demand to recognize the McMahon line as the border. In other words, the Chinese leaders, while withdrawing their claims to the occupied Indian territory in the eastern part of the border, want to consolidate their occupation of Indian soil in Aksai Chin. But India has already indicated that such an unprofitable bargain would be in no way acceptable to it.

The contention of the Beijing leaders that Sino-Indian relations can be improved without solving the border issue has become even less credible. It seems that Indian leaders do not consider it a profitable basis for negotiation. Some past events show that China's overall approach to the talks has become rigid.

China continues its military preparations on the Indian border and reports from Tibet speak of a concentration of Chinese troops there. Their total number has gone up to 500,000.

Construction and modernization of airports and radar stations are going on at high speed. A big center for ballistic missiles has been shifted and installed along the Indian border. At the same time China never refrains from interfering in Indian affairs, especially in the northeastern states. Agents trained in China are being sent to those places in order to destabilize the situation. China provides large-scale military, financial and other assistance to different subversive elements in these areas. No one can remain unconcerned about China's arming of Pakistan and the attempt being made by its agents to create anti-Indian feelings in Bangladesh and Nepal.

Exposing the objectives of these dirty games, the Indian paper NATIONAL HERALD writes: China wants to evade a solution of the territorial dispute as long as a favorable atmosphere is not created in India. The paper said: China believes that creation of an unstable situation in India will make it easier for it to conclude a favorable agreement. In South Asia also, China acts in a similar fashion.

Indian politicians also view the invitation of Subramaniam Swamy, a pro-Beijing party leader, to visit China in the same light. It appears from his statements that he openly advocates that India accept conditions favorable to China. It leads to the belief that, benefiting from the forthcoming trip of Subramaniam Swamy, China will try to put pressure on Mrs Gandhi's government through rightist opposition parties.

The commentaries and articles being published currently in the Indian press also draw the attention of the people and will have a definite effect on the Delhi talks and their outcome. The INDIAN EXPRESS said that, while talking with China, India cannot remain unconcerned about China's aggressive foreign policy. This policy, benefiting from [words indistinct] of America, is aimed at pressuring India during the talks. AMRITA BAZAR PATRIKA writes: In view of all these things, it appears that the next round of negotiations will be tough.

Television Report

LD212352 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1830 GMT 19 May 82

[From the "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] The second round of Indian-Chinese talks on normalizing relations between the two countries has begun in Delhi. The first round of the talks, held in December last year in Beijing, failed to produce positive results. At the present meeting, the Indian delegation is led by Secretary of the Indian Foreign Ministry Eric Gonsalves, and the Chinese delegation is led by special envoy of the PRC Government Fu Hao. The meeting agenda covers a wide range of topics dealing with bilateral relations between Beijing and Delhi. But the Indian side intends to focus attention at the talks, which will last until 21 May, on discussion of the territorial problem.

The official representative of the Indian Government stressed at the press conference that success in the further development of relations between India and the PRC in other fields will depend on progress in the settlement of border disputes. Let us remember that as a result of the 1962 aggression, China occupied 37,500 square kilometers of Indian territory. In addition, Islamabad has provided Beijing with more than 5,000 square kilometers of Indian land which had been illegally occupied by Pakistan. India is demanding that China return its land as a precondition for the development of normal good-neighborly relations between the two countries.

The current talks are being held behind closed doors and the sides have decided not to supply the press with any concrete details before the end of the talks. Yet it has been learned that the Chinese side has stated again that it refuses to recognize the established border between India and China in the eastern sector, which has been named the MacMahon Line. Beijing justifies this by the fact that the border was established at the time India was ruled by British colonialists. It is quite natural that the colonial rulers left many controversial disputes for the new developing countries, but you can imagine what would happen in the world if countries began solving their border problems with the aid of force, as the Beijing leadership has done.

And now, disputing the border which follows the MacMahon Line, China claims 93,000 square kilometers of Indian land, offering in exchange a small area of its own territory in another sector of the border. Naturally, India has rejected this proposal and said this would only extend the occupation of Indian land. Indian representatives report that as before, a large area of Indian territory is shown as a Chinese province on Chinese maps. Such actions, they say, can in no way contribute to an improvement in relations between the two countries. And in addition, on the eve of the talks, China continued to concentrate its forces on India's northern border. Additional Chinese military units were moved to Tibet. At present, the number of Chinese troops in Tibet reaches almost 600,000 men. Active military construction is in progress there, and new military air fields and radar stations are being created. Long-range artillery and antitank guns are being deployed on India's northeastern border. Indian observers express the view that the militarist preparations by China in Tibet, in addition to everything else, are meant to put pressure on India, for the Indians to agree to a formula on the settlement of the border problem on conditions advantageous to Beijing.

GAVRILOV COMMENTS ON INDIAN-AFGHAN RELATIONS

LD211014 Moscow TASS in English 0719 GMT 21 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 21 May, TASS -- Yuriy Gavrilo, commenting on the results of the Kabul session of the joint Afghan-Indian commission on economic and technical cooperation matters, writes in today's PRAVDA that the sides touched upon both the situation taking shape in the region now and upon relations between the two countries. It was reaffirmed again: Afghan-Indian relations develop fruitfully notwithstanding the unceasing intrigues by imperialist forces headed by the USA and by the Beijing hegemonists who act together with those forces and who seek to prevent the establishment of stability in the region.

This undoubtedly meets the basic interest of Afghanistan and India, the commentator points out. The two countries make their contribution to strengthening the Nonaligned Movement, to raising its international prestige and to the struggle against the forces of imperialist reaction and aggression.

The DRA Government's course, aimed at bringing about an end to the undeclared war against Afghanistan on the part of the USA and its accomplices, and at achieving a peaceful political settlement of stability and goodneighborliness there, finds understanding in India, the commentary says. India expresses the understanding of the irreversibility of the April Revolution.

The Indian people positively regards the DRA Government's proposals aimed at normalising Afghanistan's relations with all its neighbors and at ensuring lasting peace in the region.

"The further development of all-round contacts and cooperation between the DRA and India is now one of important factors in the normalisation of the situation in the region, their positive experience shows. Other countries interested in peace and security can, too, follow this road."

KOROLEV VIEWS GENEVA TALKS ON AFGHANISTAN

LD221724 Moscow in English to South and Southeast Asia 1500 GMT 22 May 82

[Aleksandr Korolev commentary]

[Text] Certain progress in a political solution to the problems concerning Afghanistan has emerged of late in South-west Asia, witness the agreement on holding talks between Afghan and Pakistani officials reached recently. The talks are to begin in Geneva on 15 June, with the mediation of a personal representative of the UN secretary general [name indistinct]. Characteristically the gaining of this understanding was preceded by a long process of diplomatic efforts and mediatory activity on the part of the UN. But why has it taken so much time and effort to gain an agreement that is quite natural and customary in the practice of international relations? The trouble is that, while speaking in favor of talks, the Pakistani authorities put forward different stipulations and when the Afghans accepted them Islamabad chased up new conditions which often meant direct interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs. It's not surprising, therefore, that with this kind of approach on the part of Islamabad, nearly 2 years elapsed between the time the idea of talks (?was) proposed by the Afghan Government and the practical agreement on the first contacts in Geneva with UN mediation. As a matter of fact, the Afghan Government displayed uncommon flexibility on this question also. Its foreign minister, Shah Mohammed Dost, has said in an interview for the Soviet daily IZVESTIYA that Islamabad proposed a complicated procedure of contacts instead of direct talks, which are the most effective method of reaching an understanding. We believe, the Afghan minister said, that this stance is neither the shortest nor the easiest road to success; but we have agreed to it in order to break the stalemate in the idea of a political solution to the Afghan situation.

And now, when the stalemate has been broken and an exact date for the beginning of talks has been fixed, Afghanistan's political and public circles express hope that the talks will yield positive results. According to the Pakistani press, similar sentiments prevailed in Pakistan also. But what are the ideas the two sides are coming to Geneva with?

As for the Afghan Government, its stand is perfectly clear. Afghanistan, Babrak Karmal said recently in an interview with a prominent Pashtun leader, 'Abdol (Chafar) Khan, condemns the use of force in international relations and stands for resolving disputes by peaceful means. As a developing nation, he went on to say, Afghanistan is interested in peace most of all and it is prepared to take, for the sake of ensuring peace, effective practical steps aimed at settling the differences relating to the Afghan situation.

Unfortunately Islamabad's position is not as clear as that. President Ziaul Haq (?has) expressed hopes that the talks in Geneva would result in (?definite) progress, at the same time voiced notions that posed gross interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs. He [word indistinct] for instance that the Babrak Karmal government [word indistinct] not represent Afghanistan at (?such) [word indistinct] talks. He also attempted to [word indistinct] the ringleaders of the anti-Afghan counterrevolutionary units, who [word indistinct] Pakistan, for back-stage participants in the talks. They (?will) be kept posted on the progress of the talks, he said.

(?The) notions of this kind show that even when (?dispatching) its representatives to Geneva, Islamabad still refuses to recognize the reality of revolutionary changes in Afghanistan and this controversial stand has not passed unnoticed. In the meantime, it is obvious that in order to gain a political settlement both sides must exert constructive efforts and [word indistinct] good will and readiness to (?see) the realities as they are. In short, each side must [words indistinct] of the (?road) for the sake of political settlement. This is what the Afghan Government thinks. We are confident, Foreign Minister Shah Mohammed Dost said, that with the presence of good will on both sides, all unresolved problems can be settled to mutual satisfaction.

KARMAL STOPS OVER IN TASHKENT. KIEV EN ROUTE TO GDR

Received by Rashidov

GF191401 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 0030 GMT 19 May 82

[Text] Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee and chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council, stopped over at Tashkent airport yesterday en route to the GDR on an official visit.

Tashkent airport was decorated with DRA, USSR and Uzbek SSR flags. Babrak Karmal and the delegation accompanying him were received by Comrade Rashidov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee; Comrades Anisimkin, Grekov, Musakhonov, Osetrov, Usmankhodzhaev, Khudayberdiyev, Makhmudova and (Naykomov), members and candidate members of the Uzbek SSR Communist Party Central Committee bureau; and other officials.

Kiev Stop

LD181458 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 18 May 82

[Text] Kiev, 18 May, TASS -- Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, president of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, made a stopover in Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine, today on his way from Kabul to Berlin.

KABUL CURFEW TIME REDUCED BY ONE HOUR

LD191658 Moscow TASS in English 1634 GMT 19 May 82

[Text] Kabul, 19 May, TASS -- An announcement has been made here to reduce by one hour the curfew in the Afghan capital. Now it is effective from ten o'clock in the evening till 3 hours 30 minutes in the morning. Before that, the curfew ended at 4 hours 30 minutes in the morning.

IZVESTIYA ON USSR-MONGOLIA BORDER FIRES

PM210921 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 18 May in the Morning Edition publishes on page 6 a 1,800-word own correspondent A. Kleva dispatch from the Transbaykal border district under the heading "The Wave of Fire Gave Way Before Soviet People's Courage." Kleva describes the efforts of Soviet farmers and border guards to fight an outbreak of steppe fires on the Soviet-Mongolian border in April. He reports how the members of the Dauriskiy Border Detachment saved people and livestock in Mongolia and how "railroad workers, farmers and border guards" worked together to fight the fires to protect the border village of Solov'yevsk and a nearby Mongolian village, using water from the Torey Lakes. Kleva recounts an incident in which a number of border guards suffered burns trying to save haystacks at a border post, and states that after 5 days "the border had defended all its posts. Its people did not allow the fire to reach the villages and settlements." One border guard, Pvt First Class Viktor Kotskikh, reportedly died of his burns, while others face plastic surgery.

MINISTER REPORTS ON TRAINING FOR VIETNAMESE

LD211744 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 21 May 82

[Text] The Soviet Union has agreements on economic and technical cooperation with 65 countries. Six hundred and eighty major projects have already been commissioned there. Yet to ensure an independent development any country needs national personnel, from engineer to worker. How the Soviet Union contributes to the training programs of the young states is the subject of the following talk by the minister of higher and secondary specialized education, Vyacheslav Yelyutin.

[Begin recording in Russian fading into English translation] First of all the Soviet Union provides large assistance in training specialists for the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Soviet colleges and technical schools annually admit close to 9,000 students from these countries. Today foreign students study in 300 Soviet colleges and tens of thousands of such specialists have already been trained. Soviet lecturers also help train specialists in various developing countries and a total of more than 17,000 of them are working now in 33 developing states. More than 50 educational and training centers have been opened with Soviet assistance in various countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and new centers are being opened for training skilled workers.

Another form of such training is on-the-job training at Soviet factories. We train, for example, a large number of factory workers for Socialist Vietnam, a country which sustained serious economic damage from the American aggression and which is now engaged in a program of economic reconstruction and development. There are now some 7,000 Vietnamese training in the Soviet Union for various industrial skills. This program is covered by appropriate bilateral agreements and Vietnamese workers and specialists are being trained in areas of this country which have a climate that resembles most of the climates of Vietnam, such as the cities of Krasnodar, Astrakhan, Volgograd, Donetsk and Dzhambul. All these cities are in the south of the Soviet Union. [end recording]

The government newspaper IZVESTIYA recently carried a series of interviews with some of these Vietnamese specialists who described their conditions and the kind of training they get. They point out, for example, that all their training, including learning Russian, is free of charge, that they are paid regular wages during the whole period of their training here, which is usually about a year. They are being trained in a range of 50 skills, including some highly specialized skills for their country's key industries. Having adequate numbers of such specialists is especially important for Vietnam's economy now. All Vietnamese trainees are entitled to a free two-way ticket, free clothing for winter and for summer, and a cash allowance. They also have free board and means and free medical care. All this creates appropriate conditions in which they can concentrate on their studies.

TIKHONOV RECEIVES SRV AMBASSADOR 14 MAY

LD142054 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 May 82

[Text] Nikolay Aleksandrovich Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received Nguyen Huu Mai, the SRV ambassador to the USSR, at the Kremlin today. They discussed topics of mutual interest during their friendly conversation.

BRIEFS

TRADE PROTOCOL WITH THAILAND -- A Soviet trade delegation led by Deputy Foreign Trade Minister Boris Gordeyev has held talks in Bangkok with its Thai counterpart and with the Thai Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives. As a result a protocol was signed yesterday and lists of goods were exchanged. The two sides noted that long-term contracts on economic cooperation promote the development of mutually profitable trade. [Text] [Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English to Asia 1330 GMT 14 May 82 LD]

TASS REPORTS CHANGES IN ROMANIAN GOVERNMENT

LD211400 Moscow TASS in English 1356 GMT 21 May 82

[Text] Bucharest, 21 May, TASS -- A session of the Grand National Assembly opened here today. It elected the new composition of the Council of Ministers of Romania and made changes in the composition of the State Council.

A member of the Political Executive Committee of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party Constantin Dascalescu was appointed new prime minister of the government of Romania. Former Prime Minister Ilie Verdet was appointed vice-president of the State Council of Romania.

PRAVDA REPORTS RUSAKOV DEPARTURE FOR WARSAW

PM211227 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 82 p 4

[TASS report: "At the Invitation of the PZPR Central Committee"]

[Text] On 17 May K.V. Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, left Moscow for Warsaw on a friendly, working visit at the invitation of the PZPR Central Committee.

He was seen off at the airport by I.V. Kapitonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; O.B. Rakhmanin, member of the CPSU Central Committee; CPSU Central Committee executives; and diplomatic officials of the Polish Embassy in the USSR.

SHALYGIN COMMENTARY OF ZHIVKOV-JARUZELSKI TALKS

LD211802 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 21 May 82

[Text] The leaders of Bulgaria and Poland, Todor Zhivkov and Wojciech Jaruzelski, had talks in Sofia on Thursday. The talks were part of the program of an official friendship visit to Bulgaria by a top level delegation from Poland. Yuriy Shalygin of Radio Moscow has this comment:

As press reports covering the visit indicate, the sides discussed bilateral cooperation. That was done in the context of broadening contacts in the sphere of economy and foreign policy between all the countries of the socialist community. Such cooperation has longstanding traditions, and experience has shown how useful and essential it is -- especially in the present situation -- for Poland is not the only target of the anti-Polish campaign conducted by the United States and some of its allies in NATO. They at the same time try to exert pressure on other socialist countries. Official Washington is using the Polish problem to build up international tension, to escalate the arms race and interfere in the affairs of various countries. It is in this light that the issue was discussed in Sofia and also at the talks which Wojciech Jaruzelski had in Moscow, Berlin, Prague and Budapest in March and April. As commentaries in the Polish press made it clear, the public of Poland highly assess the importance of those contacts, since they showed that Socialist Poland can always count on support from its friends and allies.

We have helped Socialist Poland with everything we have, and will do it in the future. These are no mere words, the Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev, stressed. The Soviet Union has increased shipments to Poland of various goods, including raw materials and fuel. It has provided it with considerable financial aid, including convertible currency. Shipments from the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia and other socialist countries have also grown. The socialist countries have rescheduled and eased the terms of Poland's debt payments. This help is being rendered on both a bilateral and collective basis, within the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. One of the forms is running jointly those production capacities in Poland, which are now under used as a result of the discriminatory economic measures that the capitalist West has taken under pressure from the United States.

In such a situation, Wojciech Jaruzelski noted, it can be seen with special clarity what cooperation with the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community is for Poland -- a stable, long term and equal cooperation.

KORNILOV VIEWS U.S. 'INTERVENTION' IN POLAND

LD220716 Moscow TASS in English 0650 GMT 22 May 82

["What the State Department Has in Mind..." -- TASS headline; by TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] Moscow, 22 May, TASS -- Everyone knows that the truth will out. This has been confirmed anew by John Davis, U.S. Department of State director for Eastern European affairs, who frankly admitted in his speech in the U.S. City of Alexandria with regard to the situation in Poland that, as Washington hoped, Solidarity would secure the removal of the Polish Government. Nothing more, nothing less!

This sensational piece of frankness coming from a spokesman for the Department of State did not pass unnoticed: The words were quoted by the Washington POST. Mr Davis had urgently to "correct" himself and claimed that he had been misunderstood. Nobody believed him. The State Department, in order to "smooth over" the provocative allegation, has had to make an official statement asserting that the United States has never encouraged anti-government elements in Poland and that Solidarity itself has never sought to seize power in the country.

If this disclaimer debunks anything it debunks itself! Indeed, who does not know about the true goals of the extremist Solidarity leaders who, having embarked on a counter-revolutionary path, openly tried to subvert the socio-political system in Poland! Just the other day the Washington POST published an interview with one of the former leaders of that association, Bujak, who is now in hiding, the selfsame Bujak who suggested at a sitting of the Solidarity leadership in Radom in December 1981 that the government be toppled without delay. Small wonder that the Washington POST wrote at one time that the developments in Poland were worth 50 B-1 bombers because they gave the hope for the drastic change of the balance of forces in Europe...

As for the allegations of the Department of State that the United States has never encouraged Solidarity to perpetrate illegal actions, this claim, to put it mildly, is even farther from the truth than Washington is from Warsaw. How can the ideological aggression which continues to be carried out by the United States against that sovereign country be characterized if not as pressure on Poland and encouragement of counterrevolution? How else can we view the patently provocative and inciting statements of the official U.S. radio station Voice of America and the subversive radio centre Free Europe which takes its orders from the U.S. Government and which, broadcasting to Poland, conveys round-the-clock what actually amounts to instructions to the counterrevolutionary underground, slanders socialism and incites people to "resist" the authorities? A T.V. serial of four parts shown over Polish central television the other day supplies irrefutable proof of close contacts maintained by the counterrevolutionary organizations KSS-KOR [Social Self-Defense Committee] and the "Confederation of Independent Poland" and by Solidarity extremists with the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency and its actual affiliate, Radio Free Europe.

And don't Washington's attempts to strangle Poland by waging actually an economic war on it constitute a way of "influencing" Poland as it suits the United States? It is pertinent to recall in this context, for instance, the booklet on the Polish crisis and workers' rights prepared at one time by the Research Service of the U.S. Congress, which says in so many words that economic "aid" to Poland from the United States will only be justified if Poland agrees to substantial reforms which will be compatible with American interests.

Trying to prove what cannot be proved, the Department of State claims that the United States is ready to restore normal relations with Poland but only when a return to domestic dialogue takes place in that country. But isn't this statement itself intervention in the internal affairs and another absolutely inadmissible attempt to dictate to the government of a sovereign country how to act and what line to pursue in purely internal affairs?

The "disclaimer" of the Department of State does not at all tally with incontrovertible facts! Moreover, there is good reason to rephrase the well-known saying and state that what the Department of State has in mind Mr Davis has on the tip of his tongue. His revelations expose the secret calculations of those in the U.S. administration who cannot reconcile themselves to the fact that socialist Poland has not become and will never become another Chile.

TSOPPI COMMENTS ON POLISH UNREST, WEST'S ROLE

PM211511 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 12 May 82 p 9

[Article by Viktor Tsoppi under the rubric "The Plot Against Poland": "Provocateurs"]

[Text] The history museum in Warsaw was in flames. The fire was destroying priceless documents. It was engulfing the treasure house of the people's historical memory. The provocateurs prevented the firemen from controlling the blaze by throwing rocks at them.

That was last week, 3 May. On the same day several buses were burned in the Polish capital and windows were smashed in houses and stores.... A hotel was burned down in Szczecin. The voivodship militia headquarters in Gdansk was raided. There were acts of vandalism and looting in other cities as well. And the most infamous behavior of all was seen when rampaging, rabid riffraff vilified the sacred symbol of proletarian struggle, of revolution -- they tore up, trampled on the burned red flags and the national flag of Socialist Poland. Did they know what they were doing, these people? Some maybe not -- there were many raw adolescents among the thugs. But the grownup instigators and orchestrators of the orgy who had armed the minors with petrol bombs and knuckledusters, put the flags and placards of the counterrevolutionary underground in their hands and made them chant slogans of hatred toward socialism, the PZPR and the Polish working class knew what they were about and why.

The provocateurs had crawled out of the woodwork two days before, on 1 May. On the eve of the festival the Military Council for National Salvation announced a number of measures to relax the martial law conditions, including the release of a thousand people who had been interned after 13 December. The curfew was lifted and intercity telephone communications were restored. Even the Paris LE MONDE, a zealous patron of Polish counterrevolution, was forced to concede that this was a "ray of light," although it made a point of asking: "Does this ray of light satisfy the Poles?"

May Day provided a clear answer. Some 100,000 people demonstrated in Warsaw and there were large processions in other cities beneath the banners of socialism and internationalism -- unequivocal evidence that life in the country is nonetheless returning to normal, the PZPR policy is again winning the hearts and minds of working people; and that the crisis can be overcome. Those who are out to hamper this development at any price have also realized this. The enemies of the people's state tried to spoil the festival; but they came up against the true, genuine solidarity of honest and sensible Poles. The saboteurs retreated but did not abandon their criminal designs.

Their designs? Rather -- let's be blunt about this -- their well-assimilated designs. Day after day the U.S. administration, through the medium of the CIA-owned Radio Free Europe, has dictated a similar scenario for a new counterrevolutionary sortie and has transmitted detailed instructions to people who have stooped to the contemptible occupation of hireling.

The hirelings carried out their instructions and brought a crowd of excited, hysterical sheep out into the street, and were repulsed.

The curfew is in operation again in Warsaw and some other cities. There are no evening shows. Student clubs are closed...is that what the program organizers wanted? Absolutely. They are acting in accordance with the old motto, the same old obsession: The worse it is for Poland the better it is for them and their masters. But every cloud has a silver lining. Internal and external reaction has seen that people's power has no intention of capitulating. Will the lesson be learned?

It is hard to say. The West is making the usual grumbling noises, which barely conceal vexation and disappointment. The White House is very angry too, as are the State Department and Senator Percy and the Belgian Government, and others as well. In unison they cry: How ignoble and unjust of the "Polish authorities to use force against peaceful demonstrations." So that is what they say about the political criminals with the manners of murderers who tried to provoke bloodshed throughout Poland. "Peaceful demonstrations." And then they press the Polish leadership to start a dialogue with those who invariably respond to an outstretched hand by producing a brick from their pocket and, to promote better mutual understanding, hurl it in the interlocutor's face.

One would have expected the decisions announced 30 April to have blunted the insatiable appetite of Western guardians of Poland's future. But apparently not. Already aware of this step, President Reagan made an official statement commanding the Polish leaders to "take positive action to provide hope of either the normalization of the economy or an end to the bitterness and violence," and magnanimously promised: "When that happens we will be ready to help revive the Polish economy," having first done everything to destroy it, thought Secretary of State Haig at that moment. He thought and malignantly predicted, addressing the Senate Appropriations Committee: "The economic sanctions introduced by the United States are becoming an increasingly heavy burden and may precipitate Poland's total economic collapse."

Attempting to whitewash the counterrevolution in Poland, which is inspired, raid for an directed by the West, imperialist propaganda is making holy martyrs out of its agents provocateurs. But that is no surprise.

...On 3 May the historical museum was burned down in Warsaw. Certain people are very keen to reduce Poland's history to ashes, above all the history of its struggle against fascism in alliance with the Soviet people and its ascent to socialism--to burn the people's memory. But no one has ever managed to do that.

CHEMICAL DEFENSE ACADEMY RECEIVES POLISH AWARD

PM200947 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 May 82 p 3

["Our Correspondent" report: "Presentation of Order"]

[Text] For its great contribution to the training of highly skilled command cadres for the Polish Army, the Marshal of the Soviet Union S.K. Timoshenko Military Academy of Chemical Defense has been awarded the Polish republic's Commander's Cross with star of the Order of Merit. A ceremonial meeting devoted to the presentation of this award was held at the academy on 15 May.

Those assembled were addressed by General of Division C. Krzyszkowski, chief of the Polish Armed Forces Chemical Troops. He attached the order to the academy's combat banner.

On behalf of the military academic institution's personnel, Col Gen of Technical Troops V. Myasnikov, the academy chief, expressed heartfelt gratitude to the PZPR Central Committee and the Polish State Council and Government for the high assessment of the work of the academy's collective. The order presentation ceremony was attended by Gen of Technical Troops V. Pikalov, chief of chemical troops in the USSR Ministry of Defense, and representatives of the Polish Embassy in the Soviet Union.

IZVESTIYA NOTES OPPOSITION TO CHANGE IN FRANCE

PM211101 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 May 82 Morning Edition p 5

[Correspondent A. Krivopalov dispatch under the rubric "Letter from Paris": "The Difficult Path of Change"]

[Text] Spring this year in France was marked by changeable weather which provided journalists with considerable talking points. But the whims of the weather do not arouse the man in the street very much. He is more preoccupied with the socio economic state of affairs.

There are grounds enough for unease here despite certain successes in the government's activity on the domestic front which is approved by a considerable section of the population. The health of the franc is inspiring misgivings. To maintain its exchange rate it has been necessary to resort to financial injections which have resulted in a noticeable reduction in the country's gold and currency reserves.

Everyone knows that the franc has been the victim of international market machinations. The knockout blow was delivered by a dollar excessively inflated by artificially high U.S. interest rates. Washington's "financial egoism" has been compounded by domestic factors. Major French capitalists opposed to the government's socioeconomic reform program have played essentially an antinational role. Over the year they have transferred over FR60 billion abroad, and doubled French companies' foreign investments. The government has been forced to take a number of measures, in particular tightening controls on the export of capital.

As is known, the rightwing forces managed to achieve a certain success at the recent elections to the departmental organs of self-government. The present economic difficulties, the responsibility for which is borne by the bourgeoisie which ruled France for decades, was used, paradoxical as it may seem, as the trump card in the rightwing parties' political struggle; they passed off and continue to pass off the mass unemployment, inflation and the fall in the franc as consequences of the leftwing coalition's rule.

And the following played a role, too. Many representatives of the middle strata who voted for F. Mitterrand last year did not support the socialists at the cantonal elections.

There is another noteworthy factor. When Parliament was discussing a government bill on expanding the local authorities' rights the rightwing parties gave it a hostile reception. But now, having strengthened their position in the departmental general councils, they intend to utilize these to increase the opposition to the changes outlined. As one Paris newspaper, which expresses the employers' views, wrote, a "counterpower is being established at grassroots level." The newspaper recommended specific measures that the right wing parties should take to oppose the government line.

Profiting from the rightwing parties' success, the top echelon of the bourgeoisie, whose power so far has only been partially affected, switched to counterattack. As a result of talks the employers gained a number of concessions from the government in the interests of "improving the economy," as an announcement by the premier's office stated.

The compromise with the employers caused a turbulent reaction among the various political circles. But everyone understood what it meant. A cartoon which appeared in LE MONDE is typical. It depicted rich men carrying off sacks bearing figures with many zeroes and the inscription "from the state." To one side stands a clearly shocked worker gazing at the rich men.

What had happened? The government agreed to reduce business taxes and deductions both to the state treasury and to the social assistance fund. Other relaxations on capital were also announced. The "gift to the bosses," as General Labor Confederation representatives called this action, totaled, at first estimates, about FR18 billion.

Officially, the bulk of it is to go toward expanding production and providing jobs. Few people in Paris believe this, however.

The more you have the more you want. By all accounts, the capitalists do not intend to stop at what they have gained. They are now publicly expressing the hope that the socialists will learn to "modernize their ideas on profits, capital investments, deductions for social needs, taxation and interaction between labor and capital," as the employers' newspaper LES ECHOS wrote recently. The intention of altering the government's course is obvious.

Meanwhile, Socialist Party [PS] ranks are expressing bewilderment and dissatisfaction at some aspects of the governments activity. Criticism of the council of ministers was heard at recent meetings between parliamentary socialists and the PS leadership. The premier was asked, LE MONDE wrote, for "greater consistency and clarity in formulating, implementing and explaining his policy and greater determination when measures are to be taken in a predetermined order."

The government's indulgences toward businessmen have also encouraged the bourgeoisie's political headquarters. Some opposition representatives, like former Justice Minister A. Peyrefitte and Marie-France Garaud, former adviser to two presidents, hastened to declare that France needs "another policy" and with "another majority." Garaud stated bluntly: "There can be no national unity while there are communists in the government." The fierce anticommunist onslaughts reflect reaction's fear that the French Communist Party [PCF], fulfilling its previous election promises will continue consistently and resolutely to advocate the implementation of the transformations outlined.

This spring in Paris, which has been marked by political frosts, involuntarily makes one think of what has changed in the country in the year since the leftwing forces' victory. Georges Marchais recently analyzed the situation. Addressing leaders of the capital's lower party organizations, the PCF secretary general noted that the government coalition has managed to implement a whole series of positive measures in the socioeconomic sphere and on the plane of developing democracy. Some measures -- primarily the expansion of the state sector and decentralization -- represent genuinely structural reforms. At the same time he criticized the "gifts" presented to the monopolies.

After pointing to the complexity of the present political situation, Georges Marchais stressed that not all of the great problems facing the country had been resolved. Speaking on the communists' tasks, he highlighted three avenues of party activity. They are the struggle for social justice, the struggle to expand working people's rights and the struggle for peace. Our party, he said, has participated actively in this struggle and will continue to do so.

A PCF Central Committee plenum was held recently which subjected the country's present situation to comprehensive analysis.

The most acute question in France these days is the discussion of working people's rights in enterprises. The council of ministers formulated its proposals on this score but the opposition sounded the alarm over these bills. It again intends to do battle with the authorities. Representatives of the bourgeois parties' fractions have submitted over 2,000 amendments to the government document in an effort to neutralize its content as much as possible. The discussion in the national assembly continues and there is a danger that the bills will be "truncated" if the socialists decide to make concessions to the monopolies.

Progressive France is striving for change under difficult conditions.

It is suffering blows from outside. Internal reaction is throwing a wrench in the works. There is the renewed desire to subordinate it to the American diktat. The question "who will win?" remains on the agenda. But despite all the obstacles, despite the demands of the advocates of a "breathing space" in the implementation of the policy of reforms, the leftwing forces do not intend to abandon the program with which they were victorious 1 year ago. The frost cannot stop the march of spring....

SPANISH SUPPORT FOR U.S., UK EVOKES CONCERN

LD192310 Moscow TASS in English 2238 GMT 19 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 19 May, TASS -- "The current foreign policy of the Spanish Government is a matter of profound concern for all those who, in Spain, is working for a genuine national independence and the country's worthy contribution to the consolidation of peace and cooperation between peoples", writes today's IZVESTIYA. The newspaper points out that the U.S. and NATO's course of supporting Great Britain's military operations in the conflict with the Argentine and the mounting tension in southern Atlantic have again drawn the attention of the Spanish public to the consequences that Spain's "Atlantic choice" may bring it.

IZVESTIYA stresses: "In Washington they make no secret of the fact that they would wish to sign a treaty and to formalise Spain's entry into NATO as soon as possible. They consider this is a possibility to firmly fasten Spain to their aggressive militarist plans with the clear aim of strengthening the Pentagon's presence in Spain and increasing the military potential of the Atlantic bloc."

IZVESTIYA points out that the negotiations, held throughout all this time, on concluding such a treaty have so far failed to remove the differences that have developed between the USA and Spain, above all on the question of using the American bases in Spanish territory. The Pentagon would wish to continue to be able to dispose of them at its own discretion, taking no account of the national interests of Spain. The Pentagon's plans include deploying in these bases nuclear weapons and using the bases in U.S. military operations in the Middle East and other parts of the world beyond Europe.

The newspaper points to statements by representatives of the Spanish opposition who pointed out that the government's "Atlantic choice" has been made against the national interests of Spain and that it will have a deleterious effect on its traditional relations with Latin America, and above all with the developing nations. They demanded a halt to the process of Spain's entry into NATO and first of all the settlement of the question of Gibraltar. The article says that a number of deputies have also demanded a postponement of the signing of the treaty with the USA as failing to meet the interests of Spain and, among other things, jeopardizing its relations with the countries of Latin America.

FUTURE OF U.S. BASES IN GREECE DISCUSSED

LD211306 Moscow in Greek to Greece 1800 GMT 20 May 82

[Text] The Greek press continues to comment on Secretary of State Alexander Haig's visit to Greece. Regarding his talks with Andreas Papandreu, domestic observers stress that these achieved no specific results. This conclusion was confirmed by the Greek prime minister himself when he recently appeared on television. Our commentator writes:

One of the main topics discussed in the meetings between the American secretary of state with the Greek prime minister was the future of the U.S. military bases in Greece. In this connection the government which came to power at the end of last year set as its aim to abolish finally the American bases.

This caused serious anxiety in Washington for both the White House and the Pentagon never tried to hide their concern for the fate of these military installations, so important to the aggressive American strategy. These bases play a key role in the fortunes of the NATO's southeastern flank and in the doctrine of the use of the special American Rapid Deployment Force elaborated in recent years.

In the pages of the U.S. press hints have repeatedly appeared to the effect that one of the two likely theaters for the use of these aggressive forces is the Middle East, and in this case Greece could serve as a convenient launching pad for their transfer to their area of operation. The U.S. bases in Greece have played in the past and continue to do so today the role of centers of intelligence activity for the Pentagon and NATO, aimed against socialist countries neighboring Greece and against the Soviet Union.

The new Greek Government which came to power under the slogan of conducting an independent foreign policy despite pressure from America, as happened before, believes in the need to restrict the bases' activities. This position has met with support among the broad strata of Greek public opinion. The country must rid itself of the dangerous American presence; the Greeks must not be turned into nuclear hostages of the Pentagon: These are the demands of the broad popular masses.

However, not only have the Americans not begun to prepare for the evacuation of their bases but on the contrary in every way they have expressed their intention to consolidate their military presence in Greece. According to numerous reports in the Greek newspapers, despite the fact that formally the problem of the status of the bases remains unresolved, in virtually all of them work has recently been carried out connected with the erection of additional installations through construction development of their superstructures. Still, even all this was not enough for the Pentagon, and in the area of the (Aktion) airport near Preveza a new American military unit is basically being created.

The democratic forces of Greece stress the imperative need to repulse decisively the demands of the American allies for preserving their military presence on Greek soil in one form or another. The people of Greece categorically reject the attempts to use its territory as a military-strategic launching pad against countries friendly toward Greece. These calls were sounded once again on the eve of Haig's arrival in Athens. The position of the broad masses must exert its influence on the course of the talks on the American bases in Greece, planned to take place later this summer, our commentator concludes.

FRG EASES RESTRICTIONS ON WEAPONS EXPORT

PM210857 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 May 82 Morning Edition p 4

[Correspondent A. Grigoryants "internationalcommentary" from Yu. Romanov roundup "The World Today": "Wholesale and Retail"]

[Text] Bonn -- Weapons marked "Made in West Germany" sell well on the world market. Every year exports of military hardware sanctioned by Bonn alone total DM1.5 billion. It is hard to calculate how many missiles and mortars, tanks and artillery systems are sold outside the existing official bans and restrictions.

The other day the FRG Federal Council for Security Questions adopted new directives defining the conditions for weapons exports. And? Have they finally taken account of the democratic public's demands for a check on the shameless dealers who get fat on selling instruments of death? Nothing of the kind. In the new directives the federal government assures the public of its desire to continue to display restraint in weapons exports. But how do things look in practice?

The directives in force since 1971 banned weapons exports to "regions of tension." In practice this proved to be a very loose concept and did not prevent the export of West German weapons by circuitous routes. Military industrialists bypassed the ban without difficulty, exporting rifles, missiles, tanks and ammunition either through their subsidiaries abroad or in cooperation with foreign firms. For instance, French companies freely export thousands of antitank missiles to countries involved in international conflicts, although they produce them jointly with the Munich concern Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm. It must be observed that by means of various "exceptions" the authorities themselves devalued their own bans, yielding to pressure from lobbyists and military-industrial complex, Bonn turned a blind eye to the export of military hardware to countries on its own prohibited list. As a result output from West German concerns reached South Africa, Israel and bloody Latin American dictators.

In a word, in practice the ban on weapons sales to the planet's "hot spots" was only theoretically observed. Now in the new directives, the concept of "regions of tension" is entirely absent. And it is stressed that the export of weapons and military materiel is permitted if this is in the FRG's "vital interests." The government retains the right to determine in each individual case what is meant by "vital interests."

Of course, there are no restrictions on weapons exports to NATO countries. In this market West German industry is taking key positions in the supply of tanks, aircraft and other hardware.

The government, extending the market for military concerns, has reaffirmed the freedom to export weapons to other Western countries not belonging to the North Atlantic bloc -- Australia, Sweden, Austria, Switzerland, Japan and New Zealand. In principle there are no objections to the resale of West German weapons to third countries by NATO members. For reexport it is only necessary to obtain Bonn's written consent.

As was to be expected, the new directives placed no limits on the export of weapons which FRG firms produce in cooperation with foreign partners. You can see how far the liberalism of the new directives goes from the fact that weapons installed in some systems abroad are not regarded as FRG made, for instance, rapid-firing guns installed on foreign made aircraft.

Thus the rules for exporting weapons from the FRG have been substantially revised. Bonn has accommodated the military concerns and has substantially alleviated export conditions. Bonn is joining in the global strategy of the leading imperialist states. It can be predicted that it will earn no laurels along this path.

MOSCOW VIEWS NATO INTENTIONS FOR TURKEY

LD221832 Moscow in Turkish to Turkey 1400 GMT 21 May 82

[Unattributed commentary entitled: "What Did the NATO Council Meeting Show?"]

[Excerpts] The NATO foreign ministers meeting in Luxembourg has concluded its work. The participants at the NATO meeting expressed their support for the implementation of joint measures outside the bloc's geographical area of influence. In other words, the United States wants to tie up its allies with new and dangerous undertakings. These adventurist plans are directly connected with Turkey. Efforts are being made to utilize Turkey as a connecting link in expanding NATO's area of operations as far as the Gulf and the Indian Ocean. U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig is of the opinion -- irrespective of whether NATO as an organization will decide to engage in problems arising outside its geographical boundaries -- that these problems will be connected with NATO in one way or another.

The fact that the United States, Britain, and a number of other NATO countries built up their naval and air forces in the Gulf has confirmed this military credo. Events connected with the British-Argentine dispute also confirm it.

As for Turkey, dear listeners, the U.S. press continues to pay great attention to Alexander Haig's visit to Ankara on the eve of the NATO meeting. Haig held intensive talks with Turkish leaders in Ankara. The importance attached to this visit is primarily explained by the current importance attached by official Washington to relations with Turkey, particularly to relations in the military field. The United States which has never made a secret of the fact that it looks upon Turkey as its main support point. The United States is making every possible effort to expand and strengthen its presence in Turkey & thus to reinforce NATO's southern flank. As also noted in the U.S. press, Ankara has agreed in principle to place four air bases at the disposal of the U.S. Air Force. Furthermore, Haig has obtained from the Turkish authorities a guarantee that they will not raise obstacles to the use of some other bases by the U.S. Rapid Deployment Forces for the implementation of military operations in the Middle East and the Mediterranean region.

All of this arouses an increasingly growing unease among those who support peace and friendship among the peoples. This unease is also growing in Turkey. MILLI GAZETE compares the United States with a hump on Turkey's back. According to the paper, the danger in Turkey's defense policy is connected with the United States. The United States is exerting pressure on Turkey in its relations with the Muslim countries.

SOVIET PEACE DELEGATION ENDS SYRIAN VISIT

LD211140 Moscow TASS in English 1000 GMT 21 May 82

[Text] Damascus, 21 May, TASS -- A delegation from the Soviet Peace Committee, led by Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia Aleksander Kuzmin, today left the capital of the Syrian Arab Republic for Moscow.

Talks ended in Damascus Thursday between the Soviet Peace Committee delegation and the leadership of the Syrian National Peace Council led by its chairman Muhammad Jabir Bajbuj.

The sides emphatically denounced the U.S. policy of whipping up international tension and its attempts to undermine detente. It was stressed at the talks that Washington's course towards spiralling the arms race and stationing new types of nuclear armaments in Western Europe gives cause for particular concern to the Soviet and Syrian public. The growth of U.S. imperialism's aggressiveness is attested by the adoption by the Reagan administration of the decision to start production of deadly neutron and chemical weapons, and its desire to expand the Pentagon's presence in the area of the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, as well as the conclusion of a "strategic cooperation" accord with Israel.

Dwelling on the Middle East situation, the sides pointed out that the replacement of the Israeli occupation troops in the Sinai Peninsula by American troops is a consequence of the anti-Arab Camp David deal. The farce staged in the Sinai plays into the hands of Washington alone, which received a staging area for interference in the home affairs of sovereign states in the Middle East and adjoining regions.

The participants in the talks stressed the importance of further coordination of efforts between the Soviet and Syrian peace campaigners.

The Soviet delegation was received yesterday by Deputy General Secretary of the Arab Socialist Renaissance [Ba'th] Party of Syria Abdallah al-Ahmar. The Syrian party leader thanked for the assistance and support rendered by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to the Arab peoples in their struggle against imperialism and Zionism. 'Abdallah al-Ahmar expressed satisfaction with the relations of friendship and cooperation between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Arab Socialist Renaissance [Ba'th] Party.

Aleksander Kuzmin stressed on behalf of the Soviet public the invariable nature of the support for the just cause of the Arabs on the part of the Soviet people.

PRAVDA ON EUROPEAN COUNCIL MEETING IN JERUSALEM

LD220926 Moscow TASS in English 0739 GMT 22 May '82

["Conniving at Aggressor's Actions" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 22 May, TASS -- Statesmen who sit on the European Council could not but realize quite clearly that their idea was dubious and provocative, Yuriy Glukhov writes in PRAVDA today, commenting on the holding of a scheduled meeting of the Political Committee of the European Council in Jerusalem.

The commentator recalls Israel's long-standing claims to Jerusalem. Contrary to U.S. decision on the special status of this city of July 30, 1980, the Israeli Knesset declared it "united and undivided capital of Israel", annexing the city's eastern, Arab, part. Now, the commentator writes, Tel Aviv leaders resort to all kinds of tricks to win recognition for their illegal move in one way or another.

In such circumstances, even in the opinion of FRANCE PRESSE, the move by the European Council constitutes at least an indirect endorsement of the Israeli Government's policy in the occupied Arab territories, that is, a policy of territorial annexations.

Instead of stopping expansionist actions of the aggressor, Yuriy Glukhov underlines, an indulgence is issued to him. This is exactly how the Arab world viewed the Jerusalem meeting.

This move contradicts the former position of many participants in the present Jerusalem meeting. For example, in their statement adopted in Venice the EEC countries noted that they would not agree with any unilateral initiatives called upon to alter the status of Jerusalem. But now, the commentary says in conclusion, the European Council showed exactly such an initiative, thus embarking on the road of conniving at aggressors actions.

ISRAELI DEFENSE MINISTER'S U.S. VISIT NOTED

LD221810 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 22 May 82

[Text] Israeli Defense Minister Sharon is paying a private visit to the U.S. capital. He will hold talks with Secretary of State Haig, Secretary of Defense Weinberger and other high-ranking administration officials. Sharon's visit, which is taking place in strict secrecy, clearly has the far-reaching aim of further strengthening the military-political alliance between the United States and Israel. The Israeli side is attempting to expand the sphere of strategic cooperation with the United States. In particular the Israelis are seeking the lifting of the restriction on the sale to foreign countries of weapons made in Israel under U.S. license. Tel Aviv is also demanding that the United States provide it with military orders worth up to \$200 million annually. These military orders are for the U.S. troops on the Sinai Peninsula, which are stationed there under the guise of a contingent belonging to the international forces.

COMMENTARY ON U.S. TALKS WITH MOROCCO'S HASSAN

LD220016 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 21 May 82

[Text] Newspaper and news agency reports do not arouse any doubt that the American administration has chosen the question of obtaining military bases in Morocco as the central topic of negotiations with Morocco's King Hassan II. Washington does not conceal that it strives to transform Morocco into a base for the implementation of its military adventures in the Arabian Gulf area. This was openly stated by the responsible expert official at the Pentagon. According to his words, these bases in Morocco are required to transport the Rapid Deployment Forces units to the Arabian Gulf region. On the other hand, Washington has exerted intensive efforts to attract Morocco to settling the Palestinian problem within the context of the Camp David process, namely to force this Arab country to abandon its support for the just struggle being waged by the Palestinian Arab people for their legitimate rights and interests.

However, according to King Hassan II's statements, the American administration's attempts did not get any results. In his speech following the talks held at the White House, the Moroccan king said that the United States and Morocco do not agree on a number of issues in the international situation. This is understandable because the United States is only concerned about its own interests: It completely ignores the questions that cause anxiety in the Arab world. The United States places the interests of Israel, its ally and major partner in the Middle East, at the cornerstone.

NOVOYE VREMYA COMMENTS ON U.S. GOALS IN MIDEAST

LD211530 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 21 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 21 May, TASS -- Washington has not given up its attempts to take the Camp David process out of its deadlock by drawing new participants into it, writes the Soviet weekly NEW TIMES [NOVOYE VREMYA] today.

The article says that in his recent interview with the TIME magazine the U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig "expressed the hope for a 'softening' of the position of the 'moderate' Arab countries because of the emergence of 'new factors'. What are these 'new factors' which Washington would like to use? One is the activation of the military operations between Iran and Iraq. Speculating on the continued Iranian-Iraqi war, the American propaganda is trying to intimidate the countries of the Persian Gulf by invoking the peril of the 'export of the Iranian Shi'ite revolution'. Resorting to a crude travesty of the position of the USSR which is consistently working for an end to the fratricidal war between two non-aligned countries, Washington speaks about an alleged Soviet influence on Tehran leadership. It also ascribes to Syria anti-Arab intentions in a clear bid to isolate that country which is in the vanguard of the struggle against imperialism and Zionism in the Middle East."

Referring to a new aggression which is being prepared by the Zionist forces against Lebanon, the weekly points out: "Washington does not allow Israel to launch a broad aggression in Lebanon so as to prevent the rallying Arab countries around Syria and the Palestinians. The feeling in Washington is that it would be more preferable to return to the question of liquidating the Palestine resistance movement and overthrowing the reactionary regime in Damascus after reaching a "strategic consensus," (i.e. attracting "moderate" Arab states to collaborating with the participants in the Camp David deal).

The progressive and democratic forces in the Arab countries, the NEW TIMES stresses, "perceive Washington's militarist policy and the growing aggressiveness of its strategic ally Israel as the main threat. The demagogic utterances of some of the leaders of Egypt and of pro-Western circles in other Arab states about the 'security of the Persian Gulf' constitute an attempt to divert Arab attention from this mounting threat, to justify their compromise with the U.S. foreign policy which aims at fanning anti-Sovietism to assert an absolute American hegemony over the whole of the Middle East region."

COMMENTARY ON HISTORY OF RELATIONS WITH IRAN

NC211344 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 20 May 82

[Boris Birogov commentary]

[Excerpts] From the very first days of its existence the newly formed union of Soviet republics started implementing a foreign policy based on the Leninist principles of equality of rights between big and small countries, of the unconditional recognition of their right to determine their destiny independently and of independent progress. In the first official documents concerning foreign policy -- the order of peace and the message to all toiling Muslims in Russia and the East -- the Soviet Government announced the abrogation of all the binding agreements that czarist Russia had signed with Iran and, particularly, the abrogation of the 1907 agreement between Great Britain and Russia on the division of Iran into spheres of influence.

Our commentator adds: In January 1918, the Soviet Government announced that it saw fit to establish only such relations with Iran that were based on free agreement and mutual respect between nations. On 26 June 1919, the Soviet Government issued a note to the Iranian Government and people once again announcing that it would not use the concessions granted under the capitulation regime and that it had given up all the concessions that czarist Russia previously had in Iran, to the benefit of Iran.

The establishment of diplomatic relations formed the basis for the further expansion of relations of friendship and goodneighborliness between our two countries on the basis of the principles of full equality, mutual respect and nonintervention in each other's domestic affairs. On 26 February 1921, a ceremony was held in Moscow during which an agreement was signed between the Soviet Union and Iran in which the principles of Leninist policy were manifested. This agreement was the first agreement of equal rights to be signed between Iran and Soviet Russia after the ending of the 100 years of capitulation in Iran.

In following years several protocols and agreements were exchanged between the Soviet Union and Iran, all of which led to the further expansion and consolidation of relations between the two countries based on equal rights. Pursuing the principles of a peace-seeking policy in all the stages of our country's development -- despite all difficulties created by the international situation -- the Soviet Union attached and continues to attach decisive and unequivocal importance to the joint factors that bring nations close to each other. It is not accidental that the Soviet Union was one of the first countries to recognize the Islamic Republic of Iran, before it was recognized by other countries. When after the downfall of the monarchy Iran became the target of new imperialist machinations the Soviet Government strongly condemned the aggressive objectives of the U.S. imperialists to reestablish the monarchy. The Soviet Union has always supported and continues to support the Iranian people and it extends friendly assistance to them. With Soviet technical and economic aid, dozens of units have been built in Iran and all of these are of great importance for the progress of your country's national economy. The Iranian revolution offers genuine new possibilities for the further expansion of our cooperation on the basis of the principle of (?mutual) respect.

At the 26th CPSU Central Committee Congress the leader of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev, said: The Iranian people are trying to find their path toward freedom and development. We sincerely wish them success and are prepared to expand and consolidate good relations with Iran on the basis of the principle of equal rights and, of course, on the basis of reciprocal wishes and acts.

ANTI-SOVIET STATEMENTS BY NUMAYRI, BARRE VIEWED

LD222306 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 22 May 82

[Text] President Numayri of Sudan and the Somali Foreign Minister Barre have again made anti-Soviet statements. Georgiy Tanov makes these comments:

Such coordinated actions are always alarming. Why have Khartoum and Mogadishu again spoken of an alleged Soviet menace to that part of the world? The situation in the two countries is the key to the answer. Both Sudan and Somalia are in a deep social and economic crisis and the West has noticed that. They hold the lead among African countries only in military spending. They are among the five nations with the greatest defense budgets. In both countries there is mounting public dissatisfaction with the adventuristic politics of the governments. Khartoum and Mogadishu are specially concerned about the fact that young people, military men and even business circles have started voicing dissatisfaction.

The contents of the statements of President Numayri and Foreign Minister Barre show that the statements were also made to please Egyptian leaders and Arab oil kings and shaykhs who have given financial assistance to Sudan and Somalia. In any case Abdurahman Jama Barre is more interested in financial than moral support during his tours of oil nations. That is understandable. Militarist ambitions require big spendings.

Finally, the anti-Soviet statements of Khartoum and Mogadishu, they are undoubtedly designed to distract the attention of the Afro-Arab public from the mounting military and political activities of the United States in the region. Sudan and Somalia have leased military bases to the United States. If you add to that the bases in Israel and Egypt, you can see that the Pentagon can now control the entire (?water straits) of the Red Sea.

Here is one more example. At the end of last year American paratroopers rehearsed military operations in many parts of northeast Africa. The maneuvers on the territories of Sudan, Somalia and Egypt were the first serious tests of the American Rapid Deployment Force. As the British newspaper OBSERVER has said, the force is designed to control the region and act in case of popular disturbances.

Three weeks after the Reagan administration came to power, the well-informed magazine U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT said that the administration is determined to guarantee constant American presence in the Middle East and northeast Africa. In that case the White House has been true to its word. The attempts of Khartoum and Mogadishu to make people think that the threat to the nations of the region comes from Moscow, not Washington, will hardly increase their authority and trust in them.

USSR, ETHIOPIA SIGN COOPERATION AGREEMENT

LD222250 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 May 82

[Excerpt] A new protocol on cultural and scientific cooperation has been signed between the USSR and Ethiopia. Our correspondent Aleksey Melnikov reports:

The all-round ties between our two countries are expanding with every year that passes and the articles of treaties and agreements are supplemented by new and ever more concrete contents. It is planned, with the assistance of the Soviet Union, to build in Ethiopia a power station with a capacity of 150,000 kw on the (Vadis Aden) River, a tractor-assembly plant and a cement works, while reconstruction is being carried out of the Assab oil-processing combine and the (Bartardal) polytechnic institute is being reequipped.

CPSU CC PLENUM OPENS, BREZHNEV GIVES REPORT

LD240852 Moscow TASS in English 0840 GMT 24 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 24 May, TASS -- A plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union opened here today. The plenary meeting is discussing the question of the food programme of the USSR for the period to 1990 and the measures to fulfil it. A report at the plenary meeting was made by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Leonid Brezhnev.

MOSCOW SOURCES CITED ON ECONOMIC PROBLEMS, CHANGE

PM211447 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 19 May 82 p 15

[Sandro Viola dispatch: "Plenum To Bring Big Change in Soviet Menus"]

[Excerpts] Moscow, May -- Is there really going to be a change at last in the management of the Soviet economy? This time we will not have to wait long to discover whether or not there will. In about a week's time (apparently on Monday 24 May) there will be a Central Committee plenum at the Kremlin devoted to economic problems, and in particular to the so-called "food program." This "program," whose planners have been working for a couple of years, is merely the Soviet leadership's umpteenth feverish attempt to feed the USSR's population as people are fed in all countries with sufficient resources. In other words, in sufficient quantities, with some opportunity for choice regarding products and quality, and without shopping constituting a lengthy and exhausting piece of drudgery for people, day after day.

Central Committee spokesman Vadim Zagladin [CPSU International Relations Department deputy chief] assured me that the coming plenum will be a "decisive" milestone and, more generally, that it promises major changes and improvements in the economic system. Well, we shall see. But meanwhile one can only observe that the absurd rigidity of the planning machinery, the very low productivity of labor, wastage, inefficiency and confusion have brought the Soviet economy to its most critical situation since Stalin's death.

"The rule in the Kaluga [turbine] factory, [novelist Vladimir] Tendryakov told me, "used to be indifference and alienation between one worker and another. Some collectivism, some class solidarity. The workforce lapsed into the fiercest individualism. But when work teams were authorized to divide and plan their work, when it was decided that every saving of time and materials would lead to an increase in pay, then the workers' mentality changed. They felt like entrepreneurs and everything began to work properly."

But why on earth was such a positive experiment restricted to the Kaluga turbine plant and not extended? "Well," the writer replied, "they are trying to, but every time there are problems. Factory managers have no desire to change methods, their characteristics are conservatism and immobility. So, having formed work teams on the Kaluga model, they start interfering, issuing 'orders from above,' and the workers return to their former indifference. And you know what indifference leads to: vodka and hooliganism...." Only one detail is missing, and it is one that Tendryakov cannot add: It is that the interference, the "orders from above," come not only from the management but from the party bureaucracy, the world that buried previous attempts at economic reform and that makes it difficult for any further attempt to succeed.

Of course in Moscow economic matters are not always discussed with Tendryakov's heartfelt sincerity. If you visit the EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA offices and talk to First Deputy Chief Editor Vladislav Belyanov, it almost seems that the USSR is not experiencing the slightest difficulty in the economic field and that although, admittedly, there might be a few small things that do not work, they are unimportant and that in any case the party and the government will settle everything in an instant.

Food supplies problems? Belyanov smiled benignly and confidently recited the usual propagandist nonsense: "Yes, of course the population's diet is not yet fully balanced: too much bread, and potatoes -- too many carbohydrates, in short -- and not enough protein. For that matter, is it not the same with you in Italy?"

But fortunately it is enough to talk to people who are more responsible and therefore authorized to use their brains, to hear some more serious arguments. For instance, General Lebedev, a staff missiles expert, clearly stated that arms reduction accords with the United States are vital for imparting a new thrust to the civilian economy: "Are you aware," he asked me, "of how much we want to redirect a quantity of resources currently absorbed by the military sector toward more fruitful economic uses?"

One very intelligent man, Stanislav Shatalin (an economist and member of the Academy of Sciences who is in charge of one of Moscow's most sophisticated research institutes) had no difficulty in recounting how things really stand.

"I am well aware that in the West catastrophic diagnoses are made of our economic situation. Apart from the catastrophism, there is no doubt that many elements of those diagnoses are accurate and true. For instance, the theory that our problems still center, as always, on the excessively rigid planning with which the USSR manages its economy. I will not be the one to deny that we are at the moment in a deadlock. There are still too many people in important positions (planners, but also politicians) according to whom any modification of centralized planning implies the collapse of the principles of real socialism. Maybe such ideas are not 'sacrosanct' as in the past, but they still influence the entire debate on the economy, and this at a time when it has become very clear that our present management methods are of no use in increasing productivity of in attempting at last a process of modernizing economic structures and policies.

"Almost all the mechanisms of our production system," Shatalin continued, "from prices to the introduction of new forms of technology, from incentives to new industrial structures, no longer function, are paralyzed. Hence the need to lose no time and to introduce bold decisions in the direction of a real change. But of course it is not easy, this diagnosis is shared by virtually everyone, but there are many remedies and, unfortunately very many medics who want to effect a remedy....

"On the other hand, as you are well aware, open conflicts on economic issues occur in the USSR between those who use political and ideological criteria and those who try to use real economic criteria. Who is unaware that there is still a current here opposed to incentives, which maintains that we cannot do as in the capitalist system -- that is, regard the workforce as a commodity? Nevertheless, I am optimistic to some extent. The innovation now is that talk of decentralization no longer prompts the old charges of antisocialism. It seems to me that for the first time the political apparatus is willing to attempt new paths. In any case, something must be done; the fall in the rates of production growth means that the population's living standards could decline soon."

FURTHER ON KOMSOMOL CONGRESS PROCEEDINGS

Pastukhov Report

LD181236 Moscow TASS in English 1214 GMT 18 May 82

["Struggle for Peace Is the Main Task" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 18 May, TASS -- The struggle for peace, against the threat of war is the main direction of cooperation of the Soviet youth with its coevals abroad, said Boris Pastukhov. The first secretary of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League delivered a report at the congress of the Soviet Komsomol that opened today in Moscow.

The Leninist Komsomol, the entire Soviet youth wholly and completely support the foreign policy activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state, Pastukhov said. He told the delegates of the congress that the Soviet youth organizations maintain contacts with more than 1,350 national and international youth and student organizations of different political and ideological orientation in 140 countries.

The Soviet youths and girls, Pastukhov said, strongly support actions of broad masses of the youth against the sinister plans of NATO strategists to turn western Europe into a launchpad for new U.S. nuclear missiles.

In the construction of new society, in the struggle against nuclear threat, the Leninist Komsomol acts at one with the youth leagues of countries of the socialist community, said the first secretary of the YCL Central Committee. There is no power in the world that could disrupt this inspiring unity, he said.

"Our adversaries fall over themselves to poison by lies, slander, large-scale ideological sabotage the minds of young people in socialist countries, to undermine youth leagues ideologically and organizationally," Pastukhov went on. "This has been confirmed anew by the events in the Polish People's Republic, where counter-revolution relying on the backing of external reaction was trying to win over the youth to its side, to use it as a blind tool in the struggle against the gains of socialism in the Polish People's Republic.

"Life confirms afresh that it is only by guiding by the proven Leninist organizational, political, ideological principles that youth leagues can play the role of the vanguard of the young generation, can oppose the subversive activity of the class enemy."

"We are heartened by the successes of youth leagues in capitalist countries in the struggle against the oppression by monopolies, for the interests of the working class youth, of the entire working youth, by their growing role in the anti-war movement," Pastukhov went on. "The YCL is building its cooperation with fraternal leagues being guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, following the spirit of comradeship, equality, on the basis of the community of goals in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism."

The YCL is a truly mass organization of the Soviet youth, Pastukhov said. United in its ranks are now 41.7 million youths and girls, representatives of more than 100 nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union.

Pastukhov emphasised a great role of the youth in the development of the country's economy, science and culture. More than half of all YCL members are now employed in the national economy. They participate in the development of the riches of Siberia, are contributing to the enhancement of the labour productivity, to the ensurance of the scientific and technological progress.

TV Coverage 20 May

OW200800 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian at 0745 GMT on 20 May begins its scheduled coverage of the second day of work of the 19th Komsomol Congress in Moscow. Kirilenko, Kapitonov, Dolgikh and Zimyanin are present in the front row of the presidium.

Brezhnev's Speech in Brochure

LD192048 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 May 82

[Text] The speech "Concern for the Interests of the People Is a Matter of Honor for the Komsomol", which was delivered on 18 May at the Komsomol congress in Moscow by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, has been published as a separate brochure. The brochure has been released by the Political Publishing House.

CPSU CC RESOLUTION ON OIL, GAS INDUSTRY

PM171205 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 82 p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has adopted a resolution "On the Work of the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises on Retooling and the Introduction of Progressive Methods of Construction Production."

The resolution notes that the acceleration of development efforts and the broad introduction of highly productive construction and transport machinery, progressive methods of construction production and advanced forms of labor organization are one of the main and decisive factors of the implementation by the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises of the large and complex construction program outlined for the 11th and 12th 5-Year Plans under conditions of limited manpower resources.

Fulfilling the 25th and 26th CPSU Congress decisions and L.I. Brezhnev's instructions on the accelerated development of the country's oil and gas complex, the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises has stepped up work on increasing the pace of the construction of oil and gas installations on the basis of retooling and of improving the organization of construction and management.

The efficient flow-line method of constructing oil and gas pipelines by large mechanized complexes is being widely used in pipeline installation. New types of automatic welding are being introduced, and the technology for laying gas pipelines in permafrost and marshland conditions is being improved. The modular [komplektno-blochnyy] method is being used in the equipping of oil and gas fields and the construction of compressor and pumping stations, which makes it possible to increase labor productivity by 100-200 percent and improve work quality. Easily assembled production premises and onsite [vakhtovoy] housing complexes with socioconsumer facilities, the assembling of which requires 50 percent less manpower expenditure in comparison with conventional construction, have been developed and are being introduced.

In creative collaboration with other ministries and the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises is working on the creation of special small-series construction machinery and mechanisms, including such equipment for the installation of pipelines under the complex natural and climatic conditions of the extreme north and Siberia.

In the 10th 5-Year Plan the ministry secured 85 percent of the increase in the volume of contract work through increased labor productivity as a result of the constantly increasing level of technical equipment and the improvement of the organization and management of construction. The construction time for the linear section of large main pipelines and the labor intensiveness of the installation of compressor and pumping stations have been considerably reduced.

However, the work being done by the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises on retooling and the introduction of progressive construction production methods still does not meet the increasing tasks facing this sector. The mechanization and automation of construction and installation work is not being carried out fast enough. In pipeline construction only half of the total volume of pipelines being installed makes use of automatic welding, despite its high efficiency. The mechanization of auxiliary operations is low. There are omissions in the application of the modular construction method. The ministry has not achieved a fundamental increase in the quality of pipeline construction. Violations of construction norms and regulations, deviations from design decisions and the commissioning of unfinished work occur frequently during pipeline installation, which reduces the reliability of pipeline systems.

Highly productive machinery is still not being used efficiently enough at many construction sites. There are shortcomings in organizing repair of construction machinery and transport facilities, particularly when on the road. The proportion of manual, low-skilled and heavy physical labor is being reduced only slowly. Work on developing the team contract, improving the workers' daily living conditions and reducing cadre turnover should be further stepped up.

The resolution also notes that the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the Ministry of Construction, Road and Municipal Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy and the Ministry of Chemical Industry are not fulfilling satisfactorily the targets for producing special equipment, base machinery [bazovyye mashiny], subassemblies, plant-insulated pipes and some other materials as laid down by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution of 29 May 1980 entitled "On Retooling the Construction Organizations of the Ministry of Construction of Oil and Gas Industry Enterprises in Connection With the Further Accelerated Development of Pipeline Transport in the Country."

The party committee of the Ministry of Construction of Oil and Gas Industry Enterprises and the party organizations of many construction subdivisions and enterprises are still not exerting sufficient influence on improving the activity of technical services or fostering among engineering and technical workers a creative attitude toward the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the rational and economical use of physical and manpower resources and the generalization and broad dissemination of advanced experience.

The CPSU Central Committee has resolved to regard as the most important tasks of the Ministry of Construction of Oil and Gas Industry Enterprises, its collegium and the economic leaders and party and trade union organizations of administrations, associations, enterprises and organizations that of ensuring further acceleration of retooling and broad introduction of progressive methods and advanced experience of construction production as the main and decisive condition for successful implementation of the task, put forward by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, of intensive development of the country's oil and gas complex and an accelerated increase in the extraction of gas and oil in West Siberia -- an important component of the energy program of the 11th and 12th 5-Year Plans.

The CPSU Central Committee stressed that party, soviet, economic, trade union and Komsomol organs must pay constant, very close attention to the prompt and high-quality installation and commissioning of oil and gas extraction and transportation projects on the new technical basis.

The Ministry of Construction of Oil and Gas Industry Enterprises collegium is instructed to accelerate the sector's transfer to intensive management methods; to strive persistently on the basis of the new equipment and advanced methods of production organization for a consistent increase in labor productivity, increased efficiency of capital investments and implementation of a very strict policy of thrift at all levels of construction and industry; to educate cadres in a spirit of innovation and high responsibility for the work in hand; and to ensure fulfillment and overfulfillment of plan targets for 1982 and for the 5-year plan as a whole.

It is the paramount obligation of the Ministry of Construction of Oil and Gas Industry Enterprises, administrations, associations, enterprises and construction, scientific research and planning and design organizations to expand scientific and production activity on a range of questions of technical progress and to further improve the modular and other highly efficient construction methods. Special attention should be paid to broad mechanization and automation of production processes and auxiliary operations, a decisive reduction in heavy manual labor and the increased efforts of scientists, engineers, technicians, rationalizers and inventors to develop and introduce industrial robots. Use of new equipment must be linked more closely with advanced forms of production and labor organization.

It is necessary to comprehensively support and disseminate the progressive team contract method and give the "green light" to financially autonomous teams, being guided in this by the provisions and conclusions expressed in Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's speech at the 17th Congress of USSR Trade Unions.

The CPSU Central Committee makes it incumbent on the Ministry of Construction of Oil and Gas Industry Enterprises and leaders of construction organizations and enterprises to uncover production reserves more fully and to bring them into operation more boldly. Relying on advanced collectives' experience, they should make more efficient use of production capital and construction, transport and other equipment, increase the latter's shift coefficient and constantly foster among service personnel a thrifty attitude toward equipment. They should improve the organization of vehicle and machine repair, especially when on the road, and the equipping of repair services, and should reinforce these latter with skilled cadres.

The Ministry of Construction of Oil and Gas Industry Enterprises is instructed to continue to direct the attention of technical services and scientific research and planning and design organizations toward the development and small-series production of special construction machines and mechanisms and control instruments and facilities which ensure the round-the-year construction of pipelines in the country's northern regions, as well as the switchover to installing gas pipelines with an operating pressure of up to 100 atmospheres or more.

The CPSU Central Committee requires the leaders of the Ministry of Electrical Equipment Industry, the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the Ministry of Construction, Road and Municipal Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy and the Ministry of Chemical Industry to eliminate the serious shortcomings permitted by the ministries in fulfilling the targets set by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers' resolution of 29 May 1980 for the production of the requisite equipment and materials for the construction of oil and gas industry installations.

The collegiums of the Ministry of Construction of Oil and Gas Industry Enterprises, the Ministry of Gas Industry and the Ministry of Petroleum Industry are instructed to take steps to ensure the high quality of oil and gas industry installations under construction; to place greater exactingness on leaders of planning and construction and installation organizations for the strict observance of construction norms and regulations; to react promptly and sharply to instances of low-quality work and violations of labor and state discipline and to thoroughly analyze the causes of defective output; to ensure the commissioning of new production capacities within the set deadlines and as part of a complete package including housing, cultural and consumer projects.

The CPSU Central Committee makes it incumbent on the economic leaders and party and trade union organizations of the Ministry of Construction of Oil and Gas Industry Enterprises to improve work on the selection, placement and education of cadres and to take effective steps to establish stable skilled collectives and reduce cadre turnover; to improve the system of workers' vocational training and provide them with the requisite conditions for highly productive labor; to formulate and implement measures for improving construction workers' life and daily existence; to expand the production at ministry enterprises of mobile housing complexes with cultural and consumer installations for workers in the field; to show constant concern for raising the standard of trade, public catering and consumer services.

The party committee of the Ministry of Construction of Oil and Gas Industry Enterprise and the party organizations of construction subdivisions and enterprises, scientific research institutes and design bureaus are instructed to step up organizational and educational work to develop within the central apparatus and the labor collectives the creative activity of every worker and specialist in accelerating scientific and technical progress, generalizing and disseminating advanced construction experience on a broad scale and the rational and economical use of physical and manpower resources.

[And finally], to improve the organization and increase the efficiency of socialist competition for the successful fulfillment by all construction organizations and enterprises in the sector of the pledges for a fitting greeting to the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation.

PRAVDA URGES FASTER COAL INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT

PM211011 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 82 p 1

[Editorial: "To Build Mines More Quickly"]

[Excerpts] Our country is extracting more and more oil and gas and generating more and more electricity in GES's and AES's. But this in no way means that the significance of coal in the country's fuel and energy balance is diminishing. It will continue to give us heat and light. And the task of building mines more quickly and increasing coal extraction remains urgent now, as in our first 5-year plans.

Much has been done in recent years for the better organization of mine construction. Its transfer directly to the USSR Coal Industry Ministry has enabled the sector to maneuver material and technical resources and manpower. Unity has been ensured in the planning, construction and operation of enterprises. The Soyuzshakhtostroy and Soyuzstroytek all-union associations, 5 new mine-construction combines and 10 coal-construction trusts have been set up. The construction industry's base has enjoyed further development. The technical standard of construction has improved. Appropriations for housing and sociocultural projects have increased. So far, however, no tangible changes have occurred in mine construction. In the 10th 5-Year Plan capacities for the extraction of 5 million tons of coal were not commissioned. The target was not fulfilled last year. Of course, tremendous work was done during this time to readjust the system, polish its individual links, select and place cadres and man workers' collectives. But development [stanovleniye] is clearly taking longer than it should. The sector's leadership [shtab] and its party committee and party organizations should draw the appropriate conclusions.

It is necessary, above all, to end the fragmentation of resources and funds and concentrate them on completing as quickly as possible what has been begun. It can hardly be considered normal that the Samsonovskaya-Zapadnaya mine in the Donbass has been under construction for 17 years, and there is no end to the work in sight. New construction projects are frequently commissioned with great defects -- which holds up the startup of capacities. For this reason the Dolzhanskaya-Kapitalnaya mine, which was commissioned in Voroshilovgradskaya Oblast last year, is producing considerably less coal than planned. Nor can excessive delays be tolerated in the modernization of existing enterprises, which, as is known, makes it possible to increase coal extraction more quickly in comparison with the construction of new mines.

Equipment is utilized badly on many construction sites, there are long equipment downtimes, and labor productivity is low. In the sector as a whole the volume of high-speed mine sinking is not growing, and the average rate of mine sinking also remains low. The more vigorous introduction of the team contract method would help the matter. As yet only 16 percent of the volume of construction and installation work in the coal industry is fulfilled by this progressive method.

Housing construction plans are constantly not fulfilled in many coalfields. And yet the problem of selecting and stabilizing worker cadres still remains very acute for mine construction, particularly in the country's eastern regions, where the main capacities are to be commissioned. Many of these problems are purely internal to the sector. We believe that the sector's leadership and mine construction workers, who have repeatedly proved their ability and skill in practice, will be able to resolve them quickly and will gladden the motherland with high achievements in this jubilee year.

The USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification, the USSR Ministry of Construction of Heavy Industry Enterprises and others are called upon to fulfill a considerable volume of work on the sector's construction sites. However, contractors are frequently indifferent toward the assigned job. In particular, work on a project due for completion this year -- the Pavlovskiy pit -- and the commissioning of housing for construction workers and operatives of the Katek [Kansk-Achinsk territorial energy complex] are being held up. Party committees and economic organs must take effective measures to accelerate construction.

Mine construction workers have strenuous but realistic plans for 1982. In order to fulfill them successfully party organizations and economic leaders must analyze in depth the results of work in the past months of the year, generalize and disseminate the experience of leading collectives and reveal the causes of omissions in order to ensure that they are not repeated.

The country awaits a substantial increase in coal from the sector. To do everything for the speediest commissioning of new coal extraction capacities is a very important task on whose resolution the fulfillment of the 5-year plan targets largely depends.

MINISTRIES REPLY TO CRITICISM ON AES CONSTRUCTION

PM211503 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 May 82 Morning Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "IZVESTIYA's Effectiveness"]

[Text] The USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification and the Ministry of Power Machine Building comment on the editorial "Nuclear Power Construction Projects." Taking the criticisms into account, a number of additional measures have been taken with a view to ensuring the accelerated commissioning of new capacities at AES's.

The USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification believes that the editorial (No 47) raised important questions associated with the further development of nuclear power in the country. Paying very serious attention to all the criticisms addressed to it, the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification has taken a number of additional measures to ensure the fulfillment of the AES construction program in the 11th 5-Year Plan, including mobilizing all kinds of resources on nuclear power projects due for completion this year.

The necessary material and technical resources, building structures, machines, mechanisms and transport have been allocated for the construction of AES's in 1982. This year the ranks of AES construction workers will be increased by more than 40,000 people along centralized lines. In addition, every station has been set specific targets for increasing the number of construction workers, thermal and electrical installation workers and insulation workers from specialized subdivisions of the Ministry of Power and Electrification. In addition to the organizations constructing AES's such large collectives as Kamgesenergostroy, Bratskgestroy, Volgogradgidrostroy and Volgodonskenergostroy are involved in the construction of housing, sociocultural and domestic establishments and other projects. A number of wage benefits have been established for the creation of stable collectives of construction and installation workers for new AES's.

The Ministry of Power Machine Building also examined the IZVESTIYA editorial and considers the criticism in connection with delays in delivering equipment for AES's under construction to be correct. The development and creation of equipment for AES series units is an object of special concern to the Ministry of Power Machine Building. Measures have been outlined to accelerate the production of the said equipment, and the procedure for supplying it has been agreed in conjunction with the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification to ensure the installation of AES's nearing completion.

RSFSR PRESIDIUUM EXAMINES AGRICULTURAL WORK

PM211505 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 May 82 Morning Edition p 2

[Special correspondent report: "At the RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Excerpts] At a session held 10 May the RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium examined the question of the work of experimental production farms of scientific research establishments of the RSFSR Ministries of Agriculture and Fruit and Vegetable Farming, as well as the regional departments of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences -- the all-Russian, Siberian and Non-Chernozem Zone departments.

The session was chaired by M.S. Solomentsev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

UKRAINIAN OFFICIAL VIEWS RURAL CONDITIONS

LD221934 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian at 1305 GMT on 22 May carries the "Soviets and Life" program featuring a talk on agriculture and rural life in Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast by Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman A.F. Vatchenko. While Vatchenko describes some of the awards and good results achieved in rural construction and the good work being done by soviets in the oblast the camera shows some scenes of farm life at a kolkhoz. Film reportage presents a rayispolkom chairman, a school director and the chairman of a village soviet speaking about the construction of new amenities.

As the film reportage ends Vatchenko resumes his talk, saying: "It must be said that the problems of village reconstruction are constantly kept in the field of vision by the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and local party organizations. They support in every way the initiatives of the Soviet organs in this field."

After mentioning some of the awards presented recently to leading bodies Vatchenko continues: "The problems of sociocultural construction in the villages are to be submitted for examination by the routine session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet due to be held in July this year. There we shall review the experience gained and will outline measures to eliminate bottlenecks and deficiencies -- and these unfortunately still exist. The proportion of manual labor is still substantial in the villages. Some rural inhabitants cannot make full use of the consumer services and cultural and enlightenment establishments. There is an insufficient number of establishments for children and not enough paved roads, sidewalks and so forth. This is one of the reasons for a certain number of rural inhabitants, mostly young people, leaving for the cities."

Continuing on the provision of amenities, Vatchenko says: "It must be said that there are many difficulties in the field of village reconstruction. Very often rural construction is carried out through local efforts and there arises the problem of procurement of cement, pipes, tiles and other construction materials. Although enterprise managers find a way out, the time has come to solve these problems in a centralized manner. It is even more difficult for individual construction workers, so in addition to providing loans by the state banks it seems to be necessary to increase the supply of the construction materials they require. More efficiency and more persistence must be displayed by the soviets of people's deputies, especially in the use of local materials. Of course this depends to a great extent on who lead the Soviet ispolkoms, on their attitude to the problem. Lately there has been a considerable improvement in the qualitative composition of soviet cadres. I think that during the coming elections to the local soviets, they will be joined by fresh forces, experienced and capable organizers. Naturally the future reconstruction of the villages will be directly dependent on the successful fulfillment of the national economic plans and socialist pledges for the production of agricultural produce."

'RURAL HOUR' PROGRAM ON AGRICULTURE TOPICS

LD232256 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian at 0830 GMT on 23 May carries the "Rural Hour" program comprising a discussion of agricultural topics led by writer Yu. Chernichenko with mechanic Kuleshov, raykom secretary Nedelko, engineer A.A. Vasilchenko, deputy chief engineer O.I. Chikachek and other unidentified figures. The program participants speak about the conflicting interests of kolkhozes and sovkhozes and service, repair and supply organizations and some aspects of the costs involved in the supply of agricultural equipment. Then there is a report from a sovkhoz in Altayskiy Kray in which sovkhoz workers speak about grain losses. The point is made by one person that the use of any combine harvester entails losses and that harvesting delays lead to 1.5 to 2 percent losses daily.

Following the film report Academician Barayev, chief agronomist for the virgin lands region, explains in the studio that the current practice is to use combine harvesters fitted with reapers and, after the harvesting, modifications are made for the threshing process. He says that if no reapers are available, harvesters are used as mowers, and this leads to rapid wear and early repairs.

Concerning the problem of spare parts, one speaker says that these are produced by all plants involved in the manufacture of combine harvesters and they supply spare parts in the quantities ordered or specified in the state plans.

Program presenter Chernichenko says that the Selkhoztekhnika monopoly of spares prevents machine operators from carrying out repairs in the winter when they have time available for that. He notes that machine operators must join the Selkhoztekhnika organizations to be able to carry out repairs. Speakers stress the need to remove the various obstacles in the system.

It is stated that it is necessary to protect harvesters from the weather in the 11 months in which they stand idle, to which a team leader at the Kirovskiy Kolkhoz replies that there are not enough men to repair the machinery, let alone to construct sheds for the machines. Finally, a farm chairman speaks about the cost of constructing shelters for harvesters.

EARLY MAY WEATHER, CROP DEVELOPMENT REVIEWED

PM210845 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 14 May 82 p 1

[Report by agrometeorologist N. Orlova: "The Weather and the Crops"]

[Text] In the first 1/2 of the 10-day period the weather remained cool with light frosts in the Ukraine, Moldavia, the Central Chernozem and North Caucasus Regions and the southern part of the Volga Region; it became warmer everywhere at the end of the period. It was mainly warm in the Baltic area, Belorussia, the central northwest, Volga-Vyatka and Urals regions, and also in the northern part of the Volga Region.

Winter grain crop stem growth is continuing. Everywhere in Belorussia, the Central Region, most parts of the North-West and Volga-Vyatka Regions, the northern 1/2 of the Volga Region and the Urals stem extension occurred 10-15 days earlier than average. Winter grain crops have tillered in Arkhangelskaya Oblast, northern parts of Vologodskaya and Kirovskaya Oblast, northern parts of Vologodskaya and Kirovskaya Oblasts and the Komi ASSR. Spring barley has tillered in the southern Ukraine and in the southern 1/2 of Rostovskaya Oblast and the stem extension phase has arrived in Krymskaya Oblast and in Krasnodarskiy and Stavropol'skiy Krays. Over the remaining territory of the Ukraine and Rostovskaya Oblast and in southern parts of Volgogradskaya Oblast, the Central Chernozem region and Belorussia barley has formed a third leaf.

Sugar beet shoots have appeared in the Ukraine and Moldavia. In some places the first pair of real leaves has appeared on early-sown crops, the second pair in the case of the North Caucasus.

The moisture supply is good. On 10 May the limit of apple blossom was represented by a line joining Kishinev, Kirovograd, Dnepropetrovsk, Uralsk and Ufa, while the line marking the cherry blossom limit ran through southern parts of Belorussia and of the central and Non-Chernozem Zones to the middle Volga area.

Warm weather and a good moisture supply created favorable conditions for the growth of sown and meadow grasses.

In the first half of the period the weather remained very warm in farming regions of West Siberia and in Kazakhstan. The maximum temperature was 26-30 degrees; 31-34 in the southern 1/2 of Kazakhstan. The temperature dropped in the second 1/2 of the 10-day period and most areas had rain.

Conditions for presowing cultivation of the soil and for sowing early spring crops were mainly favorable. Everywhere (except for extreme northerly winter grain areas) shoots of winter rye appeared 15-20 days early. Grasses continue to grow in West Siberia.

It remained warm and dry in the Central Asian republics, promoting the growth and development of cotton. In most parts it has developed 1-3 real leaves; on some fields in southern parts of Kurgan-Tyubinskaya Oblast it has formed the fifth real leaf.

Apple, pear, plum and apricot trees are setting. Mulberries have begun to ripen and in places vines have blossomed. Tomatoes are forming side shoots and cucumbers have formed the third leaf.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 21, 22, 23 MAY

LD220030 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 21, 22 and 23 May. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

21 May

Omskaya farmers have completed spring sowing on 1 million hectares. (0600 GMT)

Novosibirskaya farmers have sown wheat on 500,000 hectares. (0600 GMT)

In the Ukraine, potatoes are being planted on more than 500,000 hectares, the area of high-quality varieties being increased four times compared with last year. (1750 GMT)

Tulskaya Oblast has completed the sowing of sugar beet. The area sown is more than 30,500 hectares. Mineral fertilizer was spread during the sowing. (1750 GMT)

22 May

In Altayskiy Kray, 300,000 hectares is being sown daily. Wheat, barley and oats are to occupy 4 million hectares. (0800 GMT)

Spring crops have been sown on 1 million hectares in Permskaya Oblast. (1100 GMT)

In Omskaya Oblast, half the wheat area has now been sown. (1100 GMT)

In Kurganskaya Oblast, spring crops were sown on 1.5 million hectares. The weather is dry and sunny. Many farms have finished sowing corn. Sowing of potatoes, root crops and other fodder crops is in the final stages. (1100 GMT)

In Tyumenskaya Oblast, sowing will end in the next few days. Grain crops have been sown on more than 700,000 hectares. (1100 GMT)

Sowing of spring crops has been completed by machine operators in Azerbaijan. The sowing campaign was conducted at a faster rate than previous years. The area under cotton, corn, potatoes and soya has been increased through the reclamation of new land. Comprehensive cultivations are in progress in the cotton and fodder crop fields. (1200 GMT)

The first 1 million tons of fodder for public-sector animal husbandry has been procured in Uzbekistan. Perennial and sown grasses are being reaped in all oblasts. Many farms intend to carry out six or seven cuts of lucerne and to achieve an average yield of 220 or more quintals of hay. (1500 GMT)

In Kustanayskaya Oblast farmers have almost doubled sowing productivity. They have sown grain crops on 1/2 the allotted area. In round-the-clock work, machine operators have established a record work rate, 400,000 hectares per day, which is almost 100,000 hectares more than envisaged in the plan. (1800 GMT)

23 May

Spring crops have been sown on 1.5 million hectares in Kurganskaya Oblast. (0100 GMT)

The farms in Uzbekistan are completing the planting of rice. The area on which it has been sown has been increased by 6,000 hectares. Farmers in Tashkentskaya Oblast have shown a preference for the new "Avangard" strain, which yields an excellent harvest. This year the farmers of the republic have undertaken to sell to the state 550,000 tons of rice. (0130 GMT)

Over 1 million hectares have been sown to grain crops in Omskaya Oblast. (0800 GMT)

Sowing is being completed on the last of 5 million hectares in Saratovskaya Oblast. Wheat, barley, millet, sunflower and corn are being sown on the well-prepared and fertilized soil. (1330 GMT)

Spring crops have been sown on 1 million hectares in Permskaya Oblast. (1904 GMT)

PROGRESS OF SPACE COMPLEX PROGRAM DESCRIBED

LD231430 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0200 GMT 23 May 82

[Text] Here is information and commentary on the Salyut-7-Soyuz-T-5. The crew of the orbital complex, Anatoliy Beregovoy and Valentin Lebedev, are having Saturday and Sunday as rest days, according to schedule. This always means one thing -- Earth does not plan compulsory tasks. As regards routine day-to-day work connected with servicing the station, this always remains. However, on board the Salyut-7 this compulsory work is less than on board its predecessor Salyut-6.

Part of the routine duties of the crew were taken over by the system of autonomous navigation called Delta. For instance, now cosmonauts do not have to watch out for the approach of a communications link-up session. A computer does this. It connects the equipment at the right time. Delta can be given information at the cosmonauts' request and at any time about entering the "night" or "day" sides of Earth. The equipment took over the task of controlling the power supply of the station, noting in good time the diminishing reserve of electric power in the accumulators, switching on the solar batteries -- these are only some of the programs put into Delta by its creators. The crew thinks the most valuable thing is the electronics for the first time took on the responsibility for complicated operations such as the backward orientation of the station. Until now this was done manually by cosmonauts.

Delta is still only an experimental system, being tested in flight on board Salyut-7. However, the first experiments involving the computer on board showed that the ideas its creators put into it are confidently working out in practice. The specialists set themselves the long-term task of passing over to the computer on board the responsibility for everything, without exception, and of all operations in which cosmonauts are only required to mechanically control the process.

Launch of Progress-13

LD230946 Moscow TASS in English 0932 GMT 23 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 23 May, TASS -- The Soviet Union launched an unmanned cargo spacecraft Progress-13 on May 23, 1982 at nine hours 57 minutes Moscow time in keeping with the programme of ensuring the functioning of the orbital research station Salyut-7. The aim of the launching of the transport ship is to deliver consumed materials and various cargoes aboard the orbital station. [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 0935 GMT on 23 May transmitted a report of the launching which the preceding passage reads: ...to deliver consumable [raskhoduyemyy] materials and various cargoes aboard the orbital station.]

The Progress-13 spacecraft has been put in orbit with the following parameters: Maximum distance from the Earth's surface is 278 kilometres, minimum distance from the Earth's surface is 191 kilometres, the period of revolution is 88.9 minutes, inclination is 51.6 degrees. According to telemetric information, the onboard systems of the unmanned cargo ship are functioning normally.

LAUNCHING OF COSMOS-1368 SATELLITE

LD211558 Moscow TASS in English 1553 GMT 21 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 21 May, TASS -- Today the Soviet Union has launched another artificial Earth satellite, Cosmos-1368. The satellite has been put into an orbit with the following characteristics: initial period of revolution 90 minutes; maximum distance from the Earth's surface 365 kilometres; inclination of the orbit 70.4 degrees. In addition to scientific equipment, the satellite carries a radio system for the precision measurement of the characteristics of the orbit and a radio telemetry system to send back to the Earth information about the operation of instruments and scientific equipment. The equipment carried by the satellite is working normally. The ground control and computer centre is processing the information received.

FURTHER MATERIALS ON ALL-ARMY PARTY CONFERENCE

Comparison on Ustinov Speech

Comparison of the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA account of Ustinov's 13 May concluding speech at the All-Army Conference of Secretaries of Primary Party Organizations, published in the 20 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page V 7, under the subhead "Conference Closing Session," with the version supplied by the TASS report published in 14 May Moscow PRAVDA in Russian, page 3, reveals the following variations:

The PRAVDA version begins with the passage starting on page V 8, paragraph three: A concluding speech was then delivered by....

Same page, paragraph six, line three, the PRAVDA version reads: ...and activity were discussed. At the plenary sessions and in the sections many valuable ideas, observations and proposals were put forward. They must be thoroughly studied and analyzed and everything useful must be put into practice. It is necessary to hold meetings of the party aktiv and primary party organizations everywhere so as to discuss the results of the all-army conference in close linkage with military collectives' concrete tasks. The military press must play an active part in organizing and executing this work. The main guidelines....

Same page, paragraphs seven and eight read in the PRAVDA version: ...comradely mutual assistance. This is the concrete work of army and navy communists, and it must be carried out persistently and tirelessly.

The USSR defense minister went on to say that party organizations' demands as regards the state of military discipline must be strict, objective and constant. It is necessary to double and treble efforts to ensure that communists and Komsomol members set an example in combat training and service and in strengthening cohesion in military collectives. The party's demand is for strict regulation order to be sought in units and on ships.

An important direction in the activity of party organizations, the speaker noted, is to further strengthen ties with labor.

Page V 9, after paragraph one, the PRAVDA version adds: ...the armed forces. The enterprise, institution or kolkhoz gives the forces good young people, and the forces return them after they have undergone the military tempering of excellent-rated specialists. That is the living, fruitful tie between the people and the army. A tie which must be constantly maintained and developed!

The speeches at...

Same page, paragraph two, lines five and six read in PRAVDA: Many Soviet servicemen serve abroad, in the territory of fraternal countries, and fulfill the international duties.

Same paragraph, PRAVDA omits the last line: It is the duty...resolve that task!

Same page, after paragraph three, PRAVDA reads: ...step up combat readiness. After returning to your party organizations, you will become involved in their work again. You have felt....

Same page, paragraph four, PRAVDA omits in lines five and six: You must safeguard... permeated our conference.

The PRAVDA version ends with paragraph five: ...great gains of socialism and peace in the world.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial

PM210925 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 May 82 p 1

[Editorial: "For a New Upsurge in Party Work"]

[Text] The Sixth All-Army Conference of Primary Party Organization Secretaries was held in Moscow 11-13 May. It was an important stage in the life of army and navy party organizations and communists.

The conference will have an important role in activating work on further raising the initiative, activeness and principle-mindedness of party organizations and galvanizing army and navy communists and all personnel for the successful fulfillment of the tasks set the Soviet Armed Forces by the 26th CPSU Congress. The conference participants and all army and navy communists viewed the CPSU Central Committee greetings signed by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, as the party's order to continue to worthily fulfill the sacred duty of defending the socialist fatherland and as a combat program.

The reports to the conference by Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, USSR minister of defense, and Army General A.A. Yepishev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, noted that party organizations' influence on the resolution of specific tasks of combat readiness, combat duty and field, air and sea training has increased in the course of the fulfillment of the 26th CPSU Congress guidelines on defense questions. Their activity has begun to take fuller account of the particular features of the military-political situation in each specific region and the specific features of the tasks being fulfilled by each unit and ship. The arsenal of resources of party influence within the process of troop and fleet actions in a simulated combat situation has been supplemented. The socialist competition for a worthy greeting to the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation under the slogan "Reliable defense for the Soviet people's peaceful labor" has acquired broad scope. Greater concern is being shown for communists' individual excellence in training and service.

Thanks to the active work of commanders, political organs and party and Komsomol organizations, many units and ships made a new step forward in combat improvement during the winter training period. But it would be wrong to overestimate the achievements. The arsenal of resources of party organizations' influence on fulfilling combat readiness and combat training tasks is still not being fully utilized. Not all party organizations have managed to restructure their activity since the 26th CPSU Congress or translate its guidelines on raising activeness, initiative and principle-mindedness into specific deeds.

In the light of the recommendations set out in the reports and the conference resolution, party committees and bureaus and party organization secretaries are called upon to give more active help to commanders in the struggle for high combat readiness. This requires a deeper knowledge of the state of affairs in the most important areas of personnel combat training, specific measures to eliminate shortcomings and persistent struggle to raise the quality of all training and to make efficient use of every minute of training time. It is necessary to show greater principle when evaluating instances of the poor organization of training and slackness and to make party members and candidate members more strictly accountable for individual training and for combat readiness of subunits, units and ships.

Party organizations must strive more actively to ensure that socialist competition penetrates the whole training and education system and promotes the development of a spirit of competitiveness in all training. There should be greater exactingness on communists to fulfill socialist pledges.

Work on strengthening military discipline is an important area where the efficiency of party organizations and the degree of their influence on the resolution of combat readiness tasks are shown graphically. The conference cited quite a few examples of coordinated and effective measures by commanders and party organizations in this sphere. At the same time, shortcomings and omissions were evaluated in a principled way and it was pointed out that the efforts of a number of party organizations in this direction remain fully efficient. It is necessary to ensure a comprehensive approach to the resolution of tasks of further strengthening discipline, to skillfully combine organizational and educational measures and to raise the disciplinary role of combat training and of the organization of service. Party organizations must constantly consolidate one-man command and actively support demanding and resolute commanders and chiefs.

The conference called on party organizations to respond more incisively to instances of carelessness and the concealment of violations of the law and to assess in a more principled way the conduct of those communists who regard service passively, permit abuses in service and violate the norms of communist morality. Every party leader must be close to people, know their moods, requirements and needs, show activeness in resolving them, deal implacably with all instances of indifference and strive to eliminate shortcomings in the provision of material, everyday and cultural services for the personnel.

Party organizations must continue to energetically implement the party's demands on improving all ideological work. It must be distinguished by aggressiveness, high quality and efficiency, must influence the specific processes occurring in collectives' lives and the attainment of high end results in military labor and actively mold among servicemen a sense of revolutionary vigilance and class awareness. A topical task of our day is to propagandize the 26th CPSU Congress decisions and socialism's historic achievements and galvanize personnel for a worthy greeting to the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation. It is necessary to strive everywhere to ensure that every party organization and every party group is indeed the center of daily ideological education activity.

Party committees and bureaus must pay greater attention to improving internal party work and ensuring the consistent observance of Leninist principles of party membership, be more demanding in selecting people for CPSU membership, give greater significance to the candidate member stage and improve the education of communists. To this end better uses should be made of party meetings, assignments, counselling, listening to Communists' reports and so forth. It is necessary to improve the verification of the execution of party decisions and the implementation of proposals and criticisms by communists and non-party people and to establish a spirit of implacability toward shortcomings in all party organizations.

Under present conditions, when the significance of party and state discipline has increased still further, party organizations are called upon to give an incisive party evaluation to all violations of the norms of party life and communist morality and to attempts to suppress or ignore criticism.

The conference emphasized the attention paid by party organizations to the need to further improve the leadership of Komsomol and trade union organisations' activity. It was stressed that the further development of initiative, activeness and principle-mindedness in party organizations' work is inconceivable without improving their leadership by political organs.

The All-Army Conference of Primary Party Organization Secretaries outlined a broad program of measures promoting the intensification of party influence on all aspects of the life of subunits, units, ships and military training institutions. It is important that work on implementing these measures be conducted persistently and purposefully. It must be planned for the long term and used comprehensively in the interests of mobilizing personnel to achieve new successes in fulfilling the 26th CPSU Congress decisions and strengthening our glorious armed forces' combat might.

FIRST DEPUTY DEFENSE MINISTER ON VICTORY DAY

PM140859 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 May 82 p 1

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Sokolov, USSR first deputy defense minister: "Exploit of the Whole People"]

[Text] Today it is 37 years since the great victory of the Soviet people and their glorious armed forces over the dark forces of fascism and militarism.

This holiday is being celebrated in the atmosphere of the tremendous patriotic enthusiasm with which city and rural workers and army and navy servicemen are struggling to implement the historic plans of the 26th CPSU Congress and are advancing to meet the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR.

The outstanding achievements of our people and everything which is rightly the object of our pride and joy have been made possible thanks to the unexampled martial law and labor exploits carried out during the Great Patriotic War by the older generation of Soviet people. Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said from the platform of the 26th CPSU Congress: "Our people know that everything they have was created by their own labor and defended with their own blood."

Our path to victory over a strong, technically equipped and perfidious enemy was long and hard. At the beginning of the war the Hitlerites had the advantage in the number of forces concentrated in the border regions and in the quantity and quality of the different types of combat equipment. The might of the aggressor's previously prepared military machine, numbering 190 divisions, descended perfidiously on our cities and villages. From the Barents to the Black Sea there unfolded an unprecedentedly fierce battle against the enemy which settled the fate of the first socialist state in history.

Our people rose as one man against the fascist onslaught. The measured formula of the Leninist party -- "Our cause is just; victory will be ours." -- which was heard in the first hours of the war, aroused universal patriotic enthusiasm. Workers, kolkhoz members, the intelligentsia and army and navy servicemen rallied even more closely around the party and rose bodily in defense of the socialist fatherland.

The brilliant victories of the armed forces brought everlasting glory to our arms and to Soviet military art. The 40th anniversary of the battle for Moscow was celebrated recently. The heroic fighting for our motherland's capital dispelled the myth of the fascist aggressors' invincibility and profoundly influenced the whole course of World War II. The resolution and steadfastness of the Soviet command in directing the troops and the high skill in preparing and utilizing the reserves and choosing the thrust and timing of the main attack were displayed here in exceptionally severe conditions. The victory at Moscow was the forerunner of the inevitable defeat of fascism.

On this year's holiday Soviet people, veterans and young people honor the combat valor of the servicemen and the leadership skill of the commanders who defended Leningrad and Stalingrad, fought at the Kursk bulge, at Novorossiysk and on Malaya Zemlya, forded the Dnepr and liberated our cities and villages which had been temporarily occupied by the invaders. For over a year our troops, under the banner of proletarian internationalism, routed the enemy on the territory of a number of European states, liberating their peoples from the fascist yoke.

The combat spirit of the army and navy servicemen was exceptionally high. The hundreds of thousands of heroes, patriots and internationalists, the courageous sons of all our country's peoples, who fought selflessly for the freedom and independence of the socialist fatherland, are imprinted on the grateful memory of Soviet people.

The organizer and inspirer of the victory over Hitler's Germany was the Communist Party. Over half its membership were in the army in the field. The party consistently and purposefully implemented the Leninist principles of the defense of the socialist fatherland and organically combined the centralized direction of the armed struggle with the judicious initiatives of the military leaders. The party's Central Committee ensured the unity of the political and strategic leadership of the struggle against the aggressor and the unity of front and rear. By its organizational and ideological activity the Communist Party implanted in the masses an unshakable belief in our victory and the feeling of each serviceman's personal responsibility for the fate of the country, and taught steadfastness and courage.

Our entire country was a unified combat camp during the war. The production of combat equipment and weapons was expanded by the efforts of workers and engineers. The Soviet rear provided the front with an ever-increasing amount of weaponry, ammunition and equipment.

The rout of fascist Germany did not simply signify the military defeat of Hitlerism -- the hated enemy of the peoples. Thirty-seven years ago victory over the forces of reaction was won by our socialist economy, by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, by the forces of the revolutionary renewal of the world.

The victory salutes of the Great Patriotic War have long since died away. The Soviet people are living and working in peace. The CPSU, its Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee Politburo headed by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev are holding confidently aloft the banner of the Leninist foreign policy -- the banner of proletarian internationalism and peace, the banner of social progress.

We are having to build communism and fulfill the plans of our creative work in a complex international situation. The ruling circles of the United States and the other countries which belong to the aggressive NATO bloc are intensifying military hysteria. They are continuing the arms race, planning to deploy U.S. medium-range missiles in West Europe, interfering in the internal affairs of other states and elevating the "from a position of strength" policy to the rank of their official foreign policy.

Lenin's party and the Soviet state, consistently upholding the cause of peace, are taking all the necessary steps to strengthen the country's defense capability. Our approach to these questions is formulated by the party thus: The Soviet Union's defense potential must be such that nobody risks disturbing our peaceful life.

By the will of the party and the labor of our multinational people the Soviet Armed Forces are equipped with modern weapons and first-class combat equipment. A high level of technical equipment, military skill and an uncrushable morale -- such today is the combat potential of our army and our navy which ensures the reliable defense of the creative labor of the builders of communism and of our allies and friends.

Soviet servicemen fulfill their important historic mission together with the servicemen of the Warsaw Pact countries. This combat alliance is an insuperable barrier in the path of imperialism's aggressive aspirations.

The past training year and the winter training period in the districts, groups of forces and fleets attest to the intense struggle of the motherland's armed defenders to further raise the combat readiness of units, ships and subunits. The Zapad-81 exercises were a serious schooling and a strict examination of the servicemen's combat training. They were also a striking new demonstration of the indestructible unity of army and people.

The socialist competition mounted on a broad cases in the forces in honor of the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation is helping to improve the quality of combat and political training. It is proceeding under the motto "Reliable defense for the peaceful labor of the Soviet people!"

True to Lenin's party and their people, Soviet servicemen are vigilantly guarding the motherland's security and the gains of socialism.